THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Shri Pramod Mahajan.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS-Contd.

[उपसभाध्यक्ष श्रीमती जयन्ती नटराजन पीठासीन हुईं]

श्री प्रमोद महाजन (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के बाद विभिन्न समाचार पत्रों में ढेर सारी प्रतिक्रियाएं छपती हैं। आज जब मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर बोलने खड़ा हूं, तो मुझे "एकोनोमिक टाइम्स" का अग्रलेख राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर याद आ रहा है जिसे मैं प्रारम्भ में ही उद्धृत करना चाहूंगा। एकोनोमिक टाइम्स अपने अग्रलेख में प्रेसीडेंशियल एड्रेस के बारे में लिखता है—

> „The Presidential Address to the Parliament is supposed to give the people an idea of the Government's thrust in the months to come. The 57 paragraphs of tall platitudes this year suggests that its main policy thrust is to put all Members of Parliament to sleep out of sheer boredom."

यह कठोर टिप्पणी है, लेकिन मुझे नहीं लगता कि इस टिप्पणी पर और कोई नया भाष्य करना जरूरी है। राष्ट्रपति जी से अपेक्षा यह होती है कि अपने अभिभाषण के समय और सबसे पहले अपनी सरकार की उपलब्धियों को गिनाएं। मैं मानता हूं कि राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण कोई स्कूल की प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट नहीं होती, लेकिन फिर भी वर्ष के आरम्भ में उनसे यह अपेक्षा होती है कि बीते हुए समय में उनकी सरकार की क्या उपलब्धियां हैं, वह अपने भाषण के माध्यम से जनता के सम्मुख रखें। मुझे 8 मास पुरानी इस सरकार की उपलब्धियां ढूंढने के लिए सूक्ष्मदर्शक यंत्र का सहारा लेना पड़ा, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से सूक्ष्मदर्शक यंत्र का उपयोग करने के पश्चात् भी मैं उपलब्धियों को ज्यादा देख नहीं पाया। इसलिए मुझे लगा कि जब आभार के ज्ञापन पर चर्चा शुरू हो जाये तो कांग्रेस की ओर से जो पहला प्रवक्ता बोले, वह तो कम-से-कम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर उपलब्धियां कुछ गिनाएगा, लेकिन पहले प्रवक्ता का भाषण भी मैंने सुना तो मुझे लगा जैसे रवि शास्त्री ओपनिंग करने जा रहा है और वही प्रकार पूरी इनिंग में उसमें से कुछ पा नहीं पाया। अब बहुत ढूंढने के बाद, कोशिश के बाद प्रयासपूर्वक मैंने 8 महीनों में 8 उपलब्धियों को, मुझे क्षमा करें उपलब्धियों के दावों को, ढूंढ निकाला है। इन विषयों पर विस्तार से तो मैं बाद में बोलूंगा, लेकिन अभी केवल इन तथाकथित उपलब्धियों को सूचित कर उस पर छोटी सी प्रतिक्रिया देना चाहूंगा। ये 8 उपलब्धियों के दावे हैं: पंजाब में चुनाव करवाना, पाक व्याप्त काश्मीर से उग्रवादियों को नियंत्रण रेखा के पार रोकना, आसाम में शांति लाना, विदेशी मुद्रा दस हजार करोड़ करना, दिल्ली को विधान सभा देना, इजरायल से पूर्ण सम्बन्ध बनाना पूजा स्थल विधेयक लाना और दिसम्बर, 1991 में सर्वाधिक पर्यटकों को हिंदुस्तान में लाना।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, अब मैं इन आठ उपलब्धियों को देखने का प्रयास करता हूं तो संक्षिप्त प्रतिक्रिया अगर देखें, तो पंजाब में चुनाव करवाना मानो पुराने पाप को धोना है। पंजाब का चुनाव इसके पहले ही निश्चित था। वर्तमान सरकार आने के बाद बिना किसी कारण इस वर्तमान सरकार ने पंजाब का चुनाव केवल 24 घंटे पहल स्थगित कर दिया। उस स्थगित करने का पाप जो उन्होंने किया उसको इस बार धोने का प्रयास किया है। यह उपलब्धि नहीं हो सकती है।

अब पाक अधिकृत कश्मीर से उग्रवादी जो नियंत्रण रेखा को पार करके आ रहे थे, इसको हिंदुस्तान सरकार ने रोका, यह कहना तो अपने आप में इतना हास्यास्पद है, इस पर किसी टिप्पणी की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। अब, असम में किस प्रकार की शान्ति है... (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): They tried to enter with the help of Pakistan Government.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : मैं आगे इस पर आऊंगा तब बात करिए । अब, यह असम में शान्ति लाना, कुछ दिन पूर्व ही हत्याएं हुई हैं । यह अपने आप में इस दावे का खोखलापन सिद्ध करती है । विदेशी मुद्रा में दस हजार रोकड़ रुपये के बारे में आप डींग मार र हो। यह दस हजार करोड़ हमने कमाया नहीं है, विदेशी ऋण लाया है और विदेशी ऋण की मात्रा से अगर दस हजार करोड़ विदेशी मुद्रा अपने पास है तो हम कैसे विदेशी मुद्रा को अपनी समझ रहे हैं? इस विदेशी मुद्रा में अगर विदेशी ऋण का हिस्सा हटाया जाए तो आपके पास इसमें से दो हजार करोड़ भी नहीं बचता है, जो आपने आठ महीनों में कमाया होगा ।

यहां तक की दिल्ली की विधानसभा और इजरायल से पूर्ण सम्बन्ध स्थापन करने का सवाल है, ये उपलब्धियां, पता नहीं आप, अपनी क्यों मान रहे हो, क्योंकि इन दोनों विषयों का उल्लेख कांग्रेस के घोषणा पत्र में नहीं है, भारतीय जनता पार्टी के घोषणा पत्र में है । इसलिए, अगर भारतीय जनता पार्टी के घोषणा पत्र में जो दिल्ली की विधान सभा की मांग हम वर्षों से कर रहे हैं और अगर यह किया गया तो देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद... (व्यवधान) ...मैं इसका विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूं, लेकिन यह उपलब्धि आपकी नहीं है । विपक्ष में भी होकर राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर यह दो उपलब्धियां हमारी हैं । इसराइल से संबंध की उपलब्धि आपकी नहीं है क्योंकि 42 वर्ष तक आप इसका विरोध करते आए थे, अचानक एक रात्रि में आपका साक्षात्कार कैसे हो गया, जो आपने इजराइल से संबंध जोड़े हों, । तो यह उपलब्धि उनकी नहीं है बल्कि जो 42 वर्षों से इजराइल से संबंध जोड़ने की मांग कर रहे थे, उनकी है । आपने यह मांग मान ली, चलो देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद, यह तो ठीक है । लेकिन, इस मांग के पीछे यह आपकी उपलब्धि नहीं हो सकती ।

अब पूजा स्थल विधेयक तो आपने लाया है, लेकिन मूल प्रश्न को हल करने का जो आपने अपने घोषणा-पत्र में आश्वासन दिया था उसका कहीं कोई उल्लेख नहीं है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं इनका एक दावा मंजूर करता हूं कि दिसंबर, 1991 में सर्वाधिक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पर्यटक इस देश में आए और यह दावा इसलिए मंजूर करता हूं कि ऐसी भगवान भरोसे चलने वाली सरकार को देखने के लिए अगर विदेशी पर्यटक दिसंबर में बहुत मात्रा में आए हों तो उन विदेशी पर्यटकों को मैं दोष नहीं दे सकता । शायद, वे उसी के लिए आए हों, अन्यथा इनके सारे दावे खोखले हैं, जो इनकी दृष्टि से कर नहीं पाए हैं । अब अगर उपलब्धियों को देख लें तो एक वर्ष के अंदर कितनी उपलब्धियां इनको करनी थीं, मैं उनको गिनाना चाहूंगा । मेरे पास कांग्रेस का चुनाव-घोषणा पत्र है । ...(व्यवधान) ... आप कुछ कह रहे हैं ...

श्री सन्तोष बागड़ोदिया (राजस्थान): मैं आपसे कह रहा हूं कि यह घोषणापत्र जो आपके पास है, इसको आप पढ़ेंगे तो आराम पाएंगे । यही कह रहा हूं ।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : तो मैं इनको आराम देने की कोशिश करता हूं । यह जो घोषणा पत्र है, इसमें यह माना गया है, मुझे याद है कांग्रेस के किसी सदस्य ने किसी सदन में कहा था कि यह केवल साधारण घोषणा पत्र नहीं है बल्कि यह राजीव जी की अंतिम इच्छा है, उनका मृत्यु पत्र है और इस पर अमल करना कांग्रेस का महान कर्तव्य है । मैं इसमें केवल इतना पढ़ूं कि इसमें क्या कहा गया था ?

11.00 P.M.

यह सरकार ने कहा था कि जरूरी चीजों की कीमतों में वृद्धि को हम रोकेंगे और खासकर निम्नलिखित चीजों की कीमतें जुलाई, 1990 तक लौटाने की कोशिश करेंगे । डीजल से पोस्टकार्ड तक सारी सूची है जो देना मैं आवश्यक नहीं समझता ।

यह तो केवल 100 दिनों के अंदर का वादा था । मैं आशा करता हूं कि जब 250 दिनों के बाद राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण होता है तो इस अभिभाषण में इन चीजों की कीमतों को कम करने काकोई उल्लेख होता है । मुझे लगता है कि पता नहीं मेरे पास घोषणा-पत्र की जो प्रति आई है और वित्त मंत्री के पास जो प्रति आई है, इसमें मुझे काफी अंतर दिखाई दे रहा है क्योंकि मैं तो पढ़ रहा हूं कि इनकी चीजें कम होंगी—डीजल, मिट्टी का तेल, खाने का तेल और वित्त मंत्री जी को जो बजट से पूर्व घोषणा-पत्र दिया गया है उसमें लिखा है—सोने का कंगन, सोने का हार, हीरे का हार, मोती का हार, मानो इनकी कीमतें कितनी जल्दी हम कम कर सकें इसकी वे चिंता कर र हैं । डीजल से लेकर पोस्ट कार्ड तक की कीमतें अधिक बढ़ गई हैं । इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि यह आपकी सूची में नहीं है । इसके बारे आपने कहा था, यह अपका पांच साल का घोषणा-पत्र है, लेकिन आपने कहा था कि 365 दिनों में हम निम्नलिखित स्थिति देश में लाकर बतायेंगे । मैं आशा करता हूं कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में, जो 250 दिनों के बाद हो रहा है, इनमें से कुछ चीजों पर अवश्य अमल होता, जो आपकी उपलब्धि होती । इसमें 365 दिनों में कहा गया है—देहात में रोजगार पैदा करने के लिए प्रतिवर्ष एक अरब व्यक्ति दिवस • की गारंटी, प्रतिवर्ष एक करोड नौकरियों की गारंटी अर्थात् सन् 2000 तक 10 करोड नई नौकरियां । मैं 2000 तक 10 करोड़ की नई नौकरियां नहीं मानता क्योंकि तब तक यह सरकार चलने वाली नहीं है, इसके लिए मैं 2000 साल तक की आपसे अपेक्षा नहीं करता, लेकिन जिन 250 दिनों में आपने हुकूमत की तो उन 250 दिनों में आप प्रतिवर्ष एक करोड़ नौकरियां देने वाले थे, और उस हिसाब से अभी तक लोगों को कम से कम 75 लाख नौकरियां मिल चुकी होतीं, आपने एक नया रोजगार का अवसर नहीं दिया । आपने लिखा है नौकरियां, नौकरियों का अधिकांश अर्थ होता है सरकारी नौकरियां फिर भी मैं आपको राहत देने के लिए सरकारी नौकरियां नहीं कहता, रोजगार के अवसर कहता हूं वह जरूरी नहीं कि सरकार के पास ही हों, निजी क्षेत्र में भी हो सकते हैं, लेकिन कम से कम एक करोड़ लोगों के लिए रोजगार के अवसरों का निर्माण करेंगे, यह आपने 365 दिन का वादा किया था जो 75 लाख तो पूरे ही हो जाते लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहीं भी हो इसका उल्लेख नहीं है कि आपने रोजगार के लिए क्या उपलब्धि की । मैं दूसरा बताता हूं । कृषि उपज की कीमतों को तय करने के लिए नया फार्मूला लागू करना । इस नए फार्मूले का आज तक पता नहीं है । सिंचाई के लिए प्रति वर्ष 10 लाख नलकूपों का निर्माण, इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि अभी तक कम से कम साढ़े सात लाख नलकूप बनने चाहिए थे लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इसका कहीं उल्लेख नहीं है । आपने कहा था कि अनुसूचित जाति और जन जातियों के लिए प्रतिवर्ष 10 लाख आवासीय इकाइयों का निर्माण करेंगे, अब 10 लाख घर देने वाले थे अनुसूचित जाति और जन जाति के लोगों को और 250 दिनों में आपकी यह बैकलांग पूरा करना होता तो कम से कम साढ़े सात लाख घर तो मिल जाने चाहिए थे लेकिन आपने एक घर अभी तक नहीं दिया है । आपने यह कहा था कि गांवों में पिछड़े वर्ग के गरीबी के लिए 10 लाख रिहायसी ईकाइयों का निर्माण करेंगे, यह भी नहीं हुआ । आपने यह कहा था कि उच्च न्यायालयों में रिक्त सभी पदों पर न्यायाधिशों की नियुक्ति होगी, इसमें कुछ नहीं हुआ । आपने कहा था कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के सभी प्रतिष्ठानों के बोर्ड स्तर पर रिक्त पदों पर नियुक्ति होगी यह नहीं हुआ । आपने कहा कि प्रसार भारती को स्पर्धा करने के लिए सार्वजनिक निगम को रेडियो और टी०वी० के अधिकार, इसमें अभी तक आप एक कदम नहीं बढ़ा पाए हैं । और

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

जो मैं गिन रहा हूं यह आपका घोषणा पत्र पांच वर्ष का नहीं है। यह एक वर्ष का घोषणा पत्र है, और अगर एक वर्ष के घोषणा-पत्र के अनुसार 365 दिनों में आपको करना था, 250 दिनों के बाद जब राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण होता है और इस अभिभाषण में इनमें से एक भी उपलब्धि आप बता नहीं सकते तो मुझे नहीं पता चलता कि, आप कैसे अपेक्षा कर सकते हैं कि विपक्ष आपके आभार के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करे।

इसलिए उपलब्धियों की कसौटी पर राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण को देखा है तो राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण पूरा खोखला है। सरकार आठ महीने में इसमें लगभग कोई उपलब्धि बता नहीं सकती। राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण से दूसरी अपेक्षा यह होती है कि वह आने वाले वर्षों के लिए नीतियों की दिशा और गति का प्रगटीकरण करे। अगर इस कसौटी पर भी देखा जाए तो इतना ढीला-ढाला आशयहीन और दिशाहीन भाषण हमने कई वर्षों में नहीं देखा। पढ़ते जाओ तो लगता है कि सब के लिए सब कुछ लिखा है। लेकिन समझने का प्रयास करो तो लगता है कि किसी के लिए इसमें कुछ नहीं है। यह भाषण अगर पढ़ें तो यह समस्याओं की सूची है, जो कोई भी लिख सकता है। इसमें समाधान का एक शब्द नहीं है। आपके प्रयासों की दिशा के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा है। सारा भाषण फिर से पढ़ने की मैं आवश्यकता नहीं समझता। लेकिन अगर आप इस भाषण के परिच्छेद के बाद परिच्छेद पढते जाएँ तो आपको हर परिच्छेद में यह नजर आएगा कि इन्होंने केवल समस्याओं का वर्णन किया है, इसका मार्ग ढूंढने का कोई प्रयास नहीं किया है। मैं ऐसे भाषण के लिए राष्ट्रपति जी को दोष देना नहीं चाहता। वह भी क्या करें, जब एक आत्मविश्वासहीन, स्पष्टता से ज्यादा लीपापोती में और छिपाने में विश्वास करने वाली सरकार उनकी हो तो ऐसी सरकार से इससे अलग भाषण राष्ट्रपति जी को लिखकर दिया नहीं जा सकता और इसलिए मैं राष्ट्रपति जी को दोष नहीं देता, क्योंकि यह आत्मविश्वास-हीन सरकार इसी प्रकार का भाषण करती है। इस सरकार के पास न नीति-धैर्य है, न विचारों की स्पष्टता है। जो भी विचार हैं व अपने हैं, यह कहने की हिम्मत नहीं है, न सहमति है। यह सरकार आम सहमति की बात करती है, सरकार पूरे विपक्ष की बात करती है और इस सरकार की खुद अपने आप में सहमति नहीं है। इनके रक्षा मंत्री इनके ही आर्थिक कार्यक्रमों को नामंजूर करने वाला पत्र प्रधान मंत्री को लिखते हैं, जो समाचार-पत्रों में छप जाता है। इनके संचार मंत्री अपना मंत्रालय छोड़कर गृह मंत्रालय में संचार करते हैं, जिससे गृह मंत्री अपने आप में नाराज हो जाते हैं। अब अगर इस प्रकार की मंत्रि-परिषद् की रचना हो, अगर आर्थिक विचारों पर, जिसके बारे में यह सरकार का दावा है कि यह कोई नई आर्थिक क्रांति ला रहे हैं, अगर मंत्रि-परिषद् में सहमति न हो, सत्तारुढ दल में सहमति न हो तो ऐसी अपनी ही सहमति न होने वाली सरकार आम सहमति के नाम पर अपने आत्म-विश्वासहीनता को प्रकट कर रही है। आम सहमति कुछ मुद्दों पर जरुर हो सकती है। लेकिन आम सहमति का यह अर्थ नहीं है कि जिस सरकार के पास आत्म-विश्वास न हो वह हर बात में आत्म-विश्वास की बात करे, यह आम सहमति से नहीं विश्वास से चलने वाली सरकार हो सकती है और दुर्भाग्य से यह विश्वास इस सरकार के पास न होने के कारण राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में, जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि इसमें कोई उपलब्धियों का जिक्र नहीं है, उसी प्रकार आने वाली नीतियों के प्रति इस सरकार की जो भी कहानी है वह बड़ी स्पष्ट नहीं है।

अभी पंजाब में चुनाव सम्पन्न हुए। राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण पंजाब के चुनाव की कहानी से शुरु होता है। इस पर सरकार अपनी पीठ थपथपा रही है। वैसे पंजाब में चुनाव तो गत वर्ष ही होने चाहिए थे, सरकार ने नहीं किए। इस बार चुनाव हुए, आपने पाप को धोया,

देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद । मैं यह नहीं मानता कि चुनाव हुए, गलत हुआ । अच्छा होता कि पंजाब के चुनाव में जो 22 प्रतिशत जनता मतदान के लिए आयी वह तो स्वागतार्ह है ही, लेकिन अच्छा होता कि पंजाब के चुनाव में आम चुनाव की तरह जो जनता वोट देने के लिए नहीं आयी, उसके भी आने की स्थिति बनती और अगर ऐसा होता तो पंजाब का चुनाव पंजाब की समस्या को सुलझाने का एक सबसे बड़ा सुनहरा अवसर होता । मैं इसके लिए केवल सरकार को दोष नहीं दे रहा हूं । लेकिन मैं यह मानता हूं कि पंजाब की समस्या केवल किसी एक सरकार की नहीं है, भले ही पंजाब की आज की समस्या वह कांग्रेस के पुरातन राजनीति की उपज हो । लेकिन जब वह पैदा हो चुकी है तो उसको केवल कांग्रेस की समस्या मानकर पुराने पापों की आलोचना करना इससे देश के लिए पर्याप्त नहीं होगा । इससे आगे जाने का रास्ता ढूंढने का हमको प्रयास करना पड़ेगा ।

लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से चुनाव जिस प्रकार हुए हैं, जितने कम प्रतिशत लोग वोट देने के लिए आए, चुनाव के पीछे जो हमारा उद्देश्य, देश का उद्देश्य था कि पंजाब की सारी जनता चुनावों के द्वारा असली प्रतिनिधि सरकार चुनकर पंजाब की समस्या हल करने के लिए हमें उपयुक्त सहकार करे, दुर्भाग्य से यह नहीं हुआ और इसलिए जो चुनाव हुआ वह प्रतिनिधिक नहीं है । सरकार भले ही निर्वाचित हो, इस सरकार को हम निर्वाचित सरकार कानून से तो कह सकते हैं लेकिन कानून से ज्यादा उसका जो मूल आशय है, उस आशय में दुर्भाग्य से यह सरकार सही अर्थ से निर्वाचित नहीं है और इसको टैकनीकली निर्वाचित मान भी लिया जाए तो यह प्रतिनिधिक नहीं है और जब यह प्रतिनिधिक सरकार न हो तो यह अनसुलझे मसलों का समाधान नहीं कर सकती राष्ट्रपति इस शब्द का उपयोग करते हैं कि "अनसुलझे मसलों का समाधान" । यह सरकार प्रतिनिधिक नहीं है और लोग नहीं आए इसलिए 21 प्रतिशत से निर्वाचित होने वाली सरकार, सभी वर्गों का प्रतिनिधित्व न करने वाली सरकार यह काम कर नहीं सकती और खासकर अभी-अभी जो 6 पंथिक संगठनों का वक्तव्य आया है, इस वक्तव्य के पश्चात् तो पंजाब की नवनिर्वाचित सरकार की समस्यायें और पेचीदा हो सकती है ।

महोदया, दुर्भाग्य से जो हमारी पंजाब की नयी सरकार है उसका रुख अभी स्पष्ट नहीं है और आत्मविश्वासपूर्ण नहीं है । मैं मानता हूं कि पंजाब की समस्या का कोई तुरंत समाधान नहीं है, इस्टेंट सोल्यूशन नहीं है, कोई नजदीक का रास्ता नहीं है, कोई शार्टकट नहीं है लेकिन पंजाब के लिए जिस राष्ट्रीय सहमति और आम सहमति की यह सरकार दिन-रात बात करती है, इस प्रकार की एक नीति बनाए शुद्ध राजनीतिक स्वार्थों को दूर रखकर और पंजाब के लिए एक नीति बनाए जो सारी जनता की नीति हो और जो देशभक्त हों, जो संविधान के साथ हों, जो शांति का मार्ग अपनाना चाहते हों, उन सबको हम साथ लें और जो संविधान के परे हों, जो हिंसा से मार्ग ढूंढने की कोशिश करते हों, उनको पूरी सजा देने की मानसिकता अगर सरकार प्रकट करे तो मुझे लगता है कि पंजाब समस्या का समाधान ढूंढने के नजदीक तक हम पहुंच सकते हैं । लेकिन उपसभापति महोदया, मुझे खेद है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस समस्या के लिए रास्ता ढूंढने का कोई जिक्र नहीं है । मानो पंजाब में हमने चनाव करवाए और हमारा काम खत्म हो गया । इस प्रकार की केंद्र की मनःस्थिति दिखती है । हो सकता है कि पंजाब के चुनाव के कारण दूसरे सदन में डगमगाती सरकार को बारह सदस्यों का सहारा मिला हो लेकिन वह सारा राज चलाने के लिए पर्याप्त नहीं है और अगर नहीं है तो इस संबंध में अधिक विचार करना पड़ेगा ।

महोदया, अगर राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कश्मीर का परिप्रेक्ष्य देखें तो उसमें पाकिस्तान की कड़ी आलोचना की गई है जो उचित और आवश्यक है । इसमें कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं कि सारा

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

देश और सरकार, सबकी सोच एक ही है कि पाकिस्तान निश्चित रूप से पंजाब हो या कश्मीर हो, वहां के आतंकवादियों को सभी प्रकार की मदद दे रहा है और पाकिस्तान के द्वारा इस देश को तोड़ने की साजिश चल रही है जिसके लिए हमारी सरकार, संसद और जनता को सतर्क रहना चाहिए और इसलिए राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण का जो आशय है उससे तो कोई भी सहमत हो सकता है लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि यह सारा वर्णन करने के पश्चात् राष्ट्रपति जी कश्मीर की समस्या के समाधान के बारे में कोई चर्चा नहीं करते। उसके लिए किसी उपाय का जिक्र नहीं करते । माना कि पाकिस्तान का हाथ है लेकिन उस हाथ को रोकने के लिए हमारा हाथ क्या कर रहा है ?

आज पाकिस्तान एक आतंकवादी देश बना है । आतंकवादी संगठन हो सकते हैं लेकिन it is a terrorist country. अब कभी-कभी मुझे आश्चर्य लगता है कि दो लीबियाई आतंकवादी हवाई जहाज में पकड़े जाते हैं और उसके आधार पर पूरा संयक्त राष्ट्र संघ लीबिया के खिलाफ खड़ा हो जाता है । अगर उसी मात्रा में पाकिस्तान का भारत के विरुद्ध उग्रवादियों को मदद करने का काम देखा जाए तो लीबिया को जो सजा मिल रही है, जो उचित भी है, उससे सौ गुना सजा पाकिस्तान को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर मिलनी चाहिए । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में न विदेश नीति में, न कश्मीर नीति में, पाकिस्तान जो आतंकवादियों को प्रोत्साहन द रहा है, उसके खिलाफ जनमत संगठित करने का, संग्रहित करने का, पूरे विश्व का जनमत उसके खिलाफ खड़ा कर के किसी प्रयास का कोई वर्णन नहीं है ।

अच्छा तो यह होता कि जैसे बंगला देश के युद्ध के समय हमने विश्व का जनमत हमारे साथ लाने की कोशिश की, उसी प्रकार समय यह आया है कि कश्मीर के प्रश्न के संबंध में भी विश्व का जनमत हमारे साथ लाने का हम प्रयास करें लेकिन पाकिस्तान की कृति का हमारी सरकार उचित से उत्तर देती है । वह कृति करते हैं, हम भाषण करते हैं । वह घुसते हैं, हम रोकने का एलान करते हैं । इससे मसला हल नहीं होगा । इसके लिए तो कृति से कृति का जवाब देना पड़ेगा ।

महोदया, बरसों से हम मांग कर रहे हैं कि हमारी पूरी पश्चिमी सीमा पर आप सुरक्षा पट्टी का निर्माण करो । वहां रहने वाले लोगों को आप पहचानपत्र दो । जब मैं 6 वर्ष पूर्व इस सदन में आया था तब पहली बार मुझे मतदान करने का मौका मिला था और मैंने पहला मतदान कांग्रेस के प्रस्ताव के साथ किया था जब विपक्ष उसके खिलाफ था और वह प्रस्ताव था सुरक्षा पट्टी का लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि उस सुरक्षा पट्टी पर आज तक विचार नहीं हुआ । मझे तो लगता है कि देश को इसके आगे जाकर सोचना चाहिए । अगर हमें पता है कि आतंकवादियों के कैंप पाकिस्तान में लगे हैं या पाकिस्तान ने जो हमारा हिस्सा हथिया लिया है, उसमें लगे हैं तो मुझे लगता है कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा पार करके हिंदुस्तान की सेना को, इजराइल की नयी दोस्ती से कुछ सबक लेकर पाकिस्तान में जाकर आतंकवादियों के इस कैंप को ध्वस्त करना पड़ेगा और ध्वस्त करके फिर वापस भी आ जाए तो उसमें कोई परवाह नहीं है लेकिन ध्वस्त करने का जिसको अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कानून की भाषा में राईट ऑफ हॉट परस्यूट कहते हैं, उसका उपयोग करने का समय आया है, ऐसा मुझे लगता है ।

मैं यह भी मानता हूं कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो कहा है कि कश्मीर की जनता का सहयोग कश्मीर की समस्या हल करने में जरूर मिलेगा, यह अच्छी बात है । कहीं भी जनता के सहयोग के बिना बंदूक के आधार पर राज नहीं हो सकता । उनका आर्थिक विकास होना चाहिए, उनको रोजगार के अवसर देने चाहिए लेकिन

कभी-कभी मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या कश्मीर की समस्या केवल आर्थिक विकास और रोजगार की समस्या है ? इसके मूल में अगर आप कश्मीर में आतंकवादियों के संगठनों के नाम देखें तो संगठनों के नाम ही अपने आप अपनी चीज बता देते हैं।

आज सुबह जब आस्ट्रेलिया का मैच शुरू हुआ तो वहां खालिस्तान का झंडा फहरा रहा था। हम सबने इसका विरोध किया। आज कम से कम श्रीनगर से जो खबर आई है, उसमें पहले जितना गुस्सा था, उतना तो बचा नहीं है। कुछ लोगों ने तो पाकिस्तान के हारने पर मातम मनाया। फिर जो खबर है उसमें हिंदुस्तान की जीत पर कुछ लोगों ने खुशी मनाई, इस प्रकार की खबर है और यह सच है कि यह कोई शुभ संकेत है, इसका विरोध करने की जरूरत नहीं है। कोई भी राजनीतिक दल या हमारी भारतीय जनता पार्टी कश्मीर की जनता के खिलाफ नहीं है। हम जैसे कश्मीर की जनता के खिलाफ नहीं हैं उसी प्रकार कश्मीर में आतंकवादियों का सहारा लेकर पाकिस्तान की मदद से अगर कश्मीर को हिंदुस्तान से तोड़ने की साजिश होगी तो उस साजिश के साथ भी हम रह नहीं सकते। इसलिए राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में जो कहा गया है एक वाक्य, उस पर मुझे आपत्ति है। उन्होंने यह कहा है कि "संविधान के ढांचे के अंदर कोई भी बातचीत की जाएगी"। मुझे लगता है यह उचित चीज नहीं है।

कांग्रेस के घोषणापत्र को आप देखें तो इसमें "कोई भी बातचीत" का उल्लेख नहीं है। जो हिंसा को त्याग दें, क्या संविधान के ढांचे में हिंसा आती है ? क्या संविधान के दायरे में लोगों को भगा ले जाना आता है ? क्या संविधान के ढांचे में लाखों हिंदुओं को वहां से निष्कुसित करना आता है ? जो लोग ये कार्य कर रहे हैं इनसे बातचीत करके हल नहीं होगा और इसलिए मुझे लगता है कि यह जो "कोई भी बातचीत" का शब्द राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में है, वह आपत्तिजनक है, घोर आपत्तिजनक है। इससे कश्मीर के उग्रवादियों को जो संकेत मिलेगा वह अच्छा नहीं है। इससे उग्रवाद कम नहीं होगा, इससे उग्रवाद बढ़ेगा।

जो ढाई-तीन लाख हिंदू कश्मीर की भूमि को छोड़कर जम्मू या हिंदुस्तान के दूसरे हिस्सों में आए हैं, उनके बारे में राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में वर्णन है कि उन्हें वहां से वापस जाकर बसना चाहिए, मुझे लगता है कि यह उनके जख्म पर नमक छिड़कने वाला वाक्य अभिभाषण में डाल दिया गया है। वह खुशी से नहीं आए हैं। अपने सैंकड़ों वर्षों के घरद्वार, व्यापार, नौकरी, बैंकों के बैलेंस छोड़कर जब लाखों हिंदू अपने ही देश में दूसरी बार शरणार्थी बनने की नौबत पर आए हैं। तो इन लाखों हिंदुओं के प्रति कोई सम्मानजक वहां से वापस जाने की स्थिति का मार्ग राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में कहा नहीं है। मुझे लगता है कि दुनिया के इतिहास में किसी एक प्रदेश की इतनी बड़ी आबादी अपने ही देश में अपनी भूमि छोड़ने पर मजबूर हो और पूरा देश उसके प्रति खामोश हो यह आजतक कभी नहीं हुआ। मुझे कभी-कभी लगता है कि अगर इन ढाई लाख, तीन लाख हिंदुओं की जगह और कोई होता तो उस पर दिन भर चर्चा हो जाती, धरने हो जाते, संसद में हंगामा हो जाता लेकिन ढाई-तीन लाख हिंदु इधर जाएं उधर जाएं उससे क्या फर्क पड़ता है। दिन-रात सौ विषयों पर चर्चा करते हैं। कहीं किसी एक आदमी पर हमला हुआ, मैं नहीं मानता कि वह हमला उचित है, वह हमला गलत है, देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में जो हमला होता है उसकी हम चर्चा करते हैं लेकिन इन ढाई-तीन लाख हिंदुओं को एक प्रदेश से निकाल दिया जाए उसके प्रति राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कुछ न कहा जाए...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया (बिहार) : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर, सांसद महोदय जो कह रहेहैं मैं यहां पर यह आपत्ति करना चाहता हूं कि हिंदू शब्द का प्रयोग न करके अगर यह कश्मीरियों का प्रयोग करते तो अच्छा रहता । क्योंकि सिर्फ हिंदू ही वहां से माइग्रेट नहीं हुए और बहुत से लोग भी माइग्रेट हुए हैं । सिर्फ हिंदुओं की बात नहीं है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : हिंदू बहुसंख्यक हो सकता है ।

श्री मोहम्मद अकबल उर्फ मौम अकबल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : काफी बड़ी तादाद में मुसलमान भी वहां से माइग्रेट कर गए हैं ।

†[شری محمد اقبال عرف م- اقبال :
کافی بڑی تعداد میں مسلمان بھی
وہاں سے مائگریٹ کر گئے ہیں -]

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : जैसा मैंने कहा कि हिन्दुओं के प्रति कुछ लोगों की दृष्टि ही कितनी दोषपूर्ण है यह इस आपत्ति से पता चलता है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आप ही हिंदू धर्म के संरक्षक नहीं हैं। **(व्यवधान)**

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : मैंने आपको सुन लिया है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आप जो कस्टोडियन बनना चाहते हैं हिंदू धर्म के, हिंदू सम्प्रदाय के, यह गलत है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : मैंने किसी के भाषण में रोकटोक नहीं की । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आपने आप हिंदुओं का चैम्पीयन बनने की कोशिश मत करो । **(व्यवधान)** हिंदू शब्द से आप क्या कहना चाहते हैं ? **(व्यवधान)** पहले हिंदू की डैफिनेशन पढ़ लीजिए उस के बाद हिन्दू पर चर्चा करिये । **(व्यवधान)**

डा० जिनेन्द्र कुमार जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप से ज्यादा पढ़े हुए हैं । आप बैठ जाइए । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मुझे पढ़ने की सलाह दी जा रही है, लिखने की सलाह दी जा रही है मैं अपनी बुद्धि की मर्यादा मानता हूं और मैं मानता हूं कि वह आदमी समझदार होता है जो बुद्धि की मर्यादा को समझता है जो बुद्धि की मर्यादा समझता है उनके आर्गुमेंट का मुझे कोई उत्तर नहीं देना है । मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी हिंदुओं का केवल दावेदार बने, आप भी बने । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से अगर सत्तारूढ़ दल हिंदू विरोधी पालिसी अख्तियार करेगा तो उसका असर होगा ही । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : मैंने क्या हिंदू विरोधी बात कही ।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : आपकी प्रतिक्रिया बता रही है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : मेरी प्रतिक्रिया का कोई प्रतिकूल असर होता है तो मैं कोई जिम्मेदार नहीं हूं । **(व्यवधान)**

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: I don't know, why he is interrupting.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Mr.Jain, let me deal with it. Let hi n speak. Mr. Ahluwalia, let him speak

श्री हरसेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल (पंजाब) : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ।

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : यह सारा समय नोट किया जाए । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो भाषण मेरे मित्र प्रमोद महाजन जी दे रहे हैं कि वहां से निकल कर जो कश्मीरी आ रहे हैं चाहे किसी मजहब के हों वह कश्मीरी ही हैं । जो कश्मीरी वहां से निकल बाहर आ गए हैं उनके साथ हमदर्दी है, या चिंतित है या सिर्फ हिंदुओं के साथ हैं ? **(व्यवधान)**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): This is not a point of order. Mr. Mahajan, please continue.'

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : मैं प्रश्नोत्तर में नहीं जा रहा हूं लेकिन इन्होंने प्रश्न पूछा है और मैंने अगर जवाब नहीं दिया तो उसका गलत अर्थ निकलेगा । जो भी वहां से निष्क्रमित हुए हैं उन सब के साथ , चाहे किसी मजहब के हों, संप्रदाय के हों, मेरी पूरी सहानुभूति है । लेकिन उसके साथ हम यह नहीं भूल सकते . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मीम अफजल : बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया । आपने बहुत सही बात कही है ।

†[شری محمد افضل عرف م- افضل :
بہت بہت شکریہ آپ نے بہت صحیح بات کہی ہے ۔]

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : मैं तो बहुत बार सही बात करता हूं, लेकिन कभी कभी आप समझते हैं तो इसमें मैं क्या करूं ?

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, भोजनावकाश के बाद तो मैं अपना भाषण जारी रखूंगा, उसके पहले काश्मीर के बारे में . . . (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN); You have one minute, Mr. Mahajan. Your party has an hour and 10 minutes You started at 12.50 and there are two more speakers. I leave it to you.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : काश्मीर के बारे में जब भी सदन में चर्चा हुई, एकता यात्रा की चर्चा जरूर निकली । जब भी एकता यात्रा की चर्चा निकली, मैंने खामोशी से आपत्तियों को सुना । मैं आशा करता हूं कि इसके दूसरे पक्ष को, जो मैं चन्द मिनटों में आपके सामने रखने की कोशिश करूंगा, उसे शांति से सुनें । एकता यात्रा अचानक नहीं निकली । एकता यात्रा राजनैतिक थी, गैर-राजनैतिक थी, वह कितनी लम्बी थी, उसमें हिंसा क्या हुई, भाषण क्या हुए, इन सारे पहलुओं पर चर्चा करने का मेरे पास समय नहीं है । उसको मैं आवश्यक भी नहीं समझता । एकता यात्रा का जन्म कहां से हुआ, उसकी मूल स्थिति क्या थी !? गत वर्ष 26 जनवरी को श्रीनगर के लाल चौक में हिन्दुस्तान का तिरंगा झण्डा जलाया गया, पैरों तले रौंदा गया, उस ध्वज का अपमान हुआ और जो सारे एकता यात्रा के आलोचक हैं उन्होंने इस अपमान के प्रति एक शब्द भी आपत्ति नहीं की, मानों यह रोज की स्थिति हो । इस प्रकार का इसको स्वीकार किया । भारतीय जनता पार्टी एकमात्र दल था जिसने इस राष्ट्रीय ध्वज के अपमान को गम्भीरतापूर्वक लिया और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का जन-जागरण किया । दूसरे वर्ष यानी इस वर्ष श्रीनगर के लाल चौक में तिरंगा झण्डा लहराने का निश्चय किया और इसको पूरा किया । ऐसी स्थिति में इसमें आपत्ति की बात समझ में नहीं आती है । इसमें तो प्रधान मंत्री से लेकर सब को निमंत्रित किया गया था । अगर यह राजनीतिक यात्रा होती तो किसी को बुलाने का कोई

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

संबंध ही नहीं था । महत्वपूर्ण यह नहीं था कि जोशी जी किस साधन से गए । महत्वपूर्ण यह नहीं था कि वहां पुलिस थी या नहीं थी । एक क्षण के लिए यह मान लिया जाय कि जोशी जी श्रीनगर नहीं पहुंच पाते, 26 जनवरी को तिरंगा झण्डा श्रीनगर में नहीं फहराता तो भारतीय जनता पार्टी के बारे में लोग क्या सोचते, इसकी मुझे चिंता नहीं है । डा० जोशी के बारे में क्या सोचते, इसकी चिन्ता नहीं है । लेकिन 26 जनवरी को इस बार राष्ट्रध्वज लहराने की घोषणा का कार्यक्रम करने के बाद अगर यह पूर्ण नहीं होता या डा० जोशी नहीं पहुचते, अगर राष्ट्रीय ध्वज नहीं लहराया जाता तो इसका अर्थ क्या निलकलता ? अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में कश्मीर की जनता के प्रति क्या अर्थ होता ? क्या उग्रवादियों की जीत मानी नहीं जाती ? क्या हिंदुस्तान की सेना की हार मानी नहीं जाती ? क्या यह हिंदुस्तान की जनता की हार मानी नहीं जाती ? इसलिए उस दिन राष्ट्रीय ध्वज लहराना मेरी दृष्टि में इस एकता यात्रा की सबसे बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण कसौटी थी और जिस कसौटी को भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने पूर्ण किया तो उसे बधाई दी जानी चाहिए । लेकिन उसे आलोचना का पात्र माना जा रहा है । मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि इसमें आलोचना की क्या बात है । कन्याकुमारी से लेकर कश्मीर तक इस यात्रा में हिंसा नहीं हुई तो कांग्रेस वाले कहते हैं कि देखो, हमने व्यवस्था ही ऐसी की थी कि हिंसा हुई ही नहीं । अगर हिंसा होती तो ये कहते कि देखों, एकता यात्रा वाले ऐसे बद-माश हैं कि इन्होंने हिंसा करवाई । हिंसा नहीं हुई तो उसका श्रेय सरकार को । यह ऐसी ही बात है जैसी हम बचपन में बाप, बेटे और गधे की कहानी सुना करते थे । बेटा गधे पर बैठा हो तो लोग बोलेंगे कि बाप बूढ़ा है लेकिन चल रहा है । लेकिन अगर बाप बैठा हो तो लोग बोलेंगे कि बेटा बच्चा है और बाप बैठा हुआ है । अगर दोनों बैठ जायें तो गधा मर जाएगा । गधा उठा कर ले जाऐंगे तो लोग कहेंगे कि गधे को उठा कर ले जा रहे हैं । जो भी कहना हो, आपका कहना पहले से तय है । आपका कहना पहले से तय है तो स्वाभाविक रूप से इसकी आलोचना किस प्रकार से की जा सकती है । . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : हमारी ऐसी कोई मंशा नहीं है । हम बी०जे०पी० को बिलकुल गधे पर नहीं बैठायेंगे ।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : इसलिए कश्मीर के प्रश्न के संबंध में एकता यात्रा एक सफल प्रयास था जिसका उद्देश्य कन्याकुमारी से कश्मीर तक कश्मीर के प्रश्न के संबंध में जनता का एक अभिमत तैयार करना था । इसलिए इस प्रयास की आलोचना और इसमें छोटे मुद्दों को उठाकर रखना, मुझे उचित नहीं लगता ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मुझे कब तक बोलना है । ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN)' He will speak for long. The House will now adjourn for lunch till 2.30. p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-one minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled, after lunch, at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (Shri M.A. Baby) in the Chair.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भोजन अवकाश के पूर्व मैंने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के राजनैतिक मुद्दों की चर्चा की थी । भोजन अवकाश के बाद मैं अन्य मुद्दों की चर्चा करना चाहूंगा । गत आठ महीनों में वर्तमान

सरकार ने अनेक नये आर्थिक कदम उठाए हैं । सरकार का यह दावा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में वह एक नयी आर्थिक क्रान्ति ला रहे हैं ।

आर्थिक क्रान्ति के हमेशा दो पहिए होते हैं, एक राजनैतिक नेतृत्व और दूसरा अफसरशाही । अब इस आर्थिक परिवर्तन पर प्रक्रिया देने से पहले मैं दो पहियों का थोड़ा निरीक्षण करना चाहूंगा ... (व्यवधान) ठीक है क्रांति नहीं कर रहे हैं तो बहुत अच्छी बात है ।

श्री विट्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव : (महाराष्ट्र) : क्रांति कोई नहीं करता सिर्फ चेंज हो सकता है ।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : जो भी आर्थिक परिवर्तन आप कर रहे हैं इन आर्थिक परिवर्तनों को करने के लिए जिस अफसरशाही के द्वारा इन परिवर्तनों का मसौदा बन रहा है, संयोग से वह सारी अफसरशाही कभी न कभी विश्व बैंक से संबंधित रही है । इसलिए इनका विश्व बैंक से संबंधित होना, इस संयोग के प्रकाश में ही इन परिवर्तनों को देखना चाहिए । जहां तक राजनैतिक नेतृत्व का संबंध है यह विश्वास से परिवर्तन नहीं कर रहा है । मानों किसी के कहने में परिवर्तन की स्थिति आई है ।

गत आठ महीनों में आर्थिक क्षेत्र में जो भी कुछ हुआ है उसका यह स्पष्ट अर्थ है कि आज तक हिंदुस्तान की अर्थनीति में जो नेहरूवियन माडल था वर्तमान सरकार ने इस माडल को नकारा है और पूर्ण रूप से एक नयी दिशा की ओर जा रहे हैं । वर्तमान सरकार ने जितने आर्थिक परिवर्तन के कदम उठाये हैं ये इनके घोषणापत्र का हिस्सा नहीं है । ये इनकी आज तक की घोषित नीतियों के भी अंग नहीं हैं । दुख इस बात का है कि जैसे एक ओर से अफसरशाही कभी न कभी विश्व बैंक से संबंधित रही है उसी प्रकार से राजनैतिक नेतृत्व विश्वास के साथ इन परिवर्तनों में हिम्मत करके कुछ करने की सोच नहीं रहा है । इसलिए किसी और के इशारे पर जब इतने बड़े परिवर्तन का कदम उठाया जाता है जिसके प्रति स्वयं राजनैतिक नेतृत्व को विश्वास न हो तो मुझे डर है कि अंतिमतः यह परिवर्तन जब चरम सीमा पर जाएगा तो देश की स्थिति न घर की न घाट की जैसी हो जाएगी ।

आजकल विश्व बैंक और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष से ऋण लेना, उनकी शर्तें, हमारी सार्वभौमिकता आदि बड़ी चर्चा में हैं । लेकिन सारी चर्चा में हम एक प्रश्न भूल जाते हैं कि आखिर इन अंतर्राष्ट्रीय एजेंसियों द्वारा ऋण लेने की नौबत क्यों आई । हिंदुस्तान आज दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा भिखारी देश क्यों बना ? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि 42 वर्षों तक जिस प्रकार की नीतियां हमने अपनाई इन नीतियों के पश्चात् देश की यह स्थिति आई कि ऋण चुकाने के लिए भी या ऋण का ब्याज देने के लिए भी नये ऋण लेने की स्थिति में देश पहुंच गया है । इसलिए जिस आर्थिक संकट की चर्चा प्रधान मंत्री और वित्त मंत्री प्रतिदिन, दिनरात करते हैं आखिर यह आर्थिक संकट किसके पाप की देन है । आर्थिक संकट कोई एक रात में नहीं आता है, कोई 6-8 महीने चलने वाली सरकार नहीं लाती । आर्थिक संकट तो 30-40 वर्ष तक जो नीतियां इस देश में अपनाई गयीं उन नीतियों के कारण आया है । इसलिए सरकार के पास अगर ईमानदारी का कुछ भी अंश होता तो अपने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में आर्थिक संकट से निपटने की चर्चा करने के पहले इस आर्थिक संकट की जिम्मेदारी लेती जो 42 वर्षों में इस देश में अधिकांश वर्ष तक राज करने में कांग्रेस की नीतियों के कारण आया है । इसलिए सबसे पहले इतना बड़ा कर्जा लेकर हिंदुस्तान को दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा भिखारी देश बनाना, इसके लिए जो

कांग्रेस की जिम्मेदारी है नैतिक और प्रत्यक्ष उस जिम्मेदारी से कांग्रेस अपने आपको अलग नहीं कर सकती ।

दूसरा ऋण लेने की नौबत आई तो क्या इस ऋण लेने का कोई विकल्प था । इसमें मुझे यह कहने में कोई संकोच नहीं है कि जिस आर्थिक स्थिति में 42 वर्ष के बाद कांग्रेस देश को ले आई है उस स्थिति में जब हम जुलाई में पहुंचे तो विश्व बैंक के अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष से ऋण लेने के सिवाय और कोई विकल्प देश के सामने नहीं था । अब यह ऋण लेने के बाद स्वाभाविक रूप से उनकी ओर से शर्तें लगाई गई । अब चर्चा इस देश में यह होती है कि शर्तें लगा कर क्या हमने देश का सार्वभौमित्व खोया है ।

जहां तक मैं समझता हूं कि कोई भी देश, कोई भी संस्था, कोई भी बैंक जब कर्जा देगा, तो उसके साथ कुछ न कुछ शर्तें जरूर आयेंगी । बिना शर्तों के कोई कर्ज नहीं दे सकता और अगर हमको किसी भी प्रकार की शर्तें मंजूर नहीं है, तो हमको वहां कर्ज मांगने को जाने की जरूरत नहीं थी । उन्होंने कोई न्यौता नहीं भेजा था और इसलिए यदि हम गये हैं, तो कुछ शर्तें आयेंगी । इसलिए शर्तें आई हैं, मुझे कोई शिकायत नहीं है । शर्त जरूर आयेंगी, किसी भी कर्जे के साथ शर्तें जरूर आयेंगी । लेकिन सवाल यह होता है कि जो शर्तें आती हैं, उनको स्वीकार करने के पहले भी कर्जदार को अपना स्वातंत्र्य होता है कि वह उनमें से कुछ शर्तों को नकारे इनमें से कुछ जो देश के हित में शर्तें हैं, उनको स्वीकार कर लें और जो हित में नहीं हैं, उनको वह नकारें ।

लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से इस सारी चर्चा में मेरी तीन मूल आपत्तियां हैं, जिसका उल्लेख यदि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में होता, तो अच्छा होता ।

इन शर्तों के प्रति अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष या विश्व बैंक के संबंध में हमारी जो भी चर्चायें हुई हैं, उनके प्रति बड़ा ही गुप्तता का रूप दिया गया है । इसमें वैसे छिपाने के लायक कुछ नहीं था । अगर सरकार का विश्वास था कि जो भी सरकार कर रही है, वह देश के हित में कर रही है, तो हिम्मत से सरकार कहती कि यह करना चाहिए, यह हम कर रहे हैं । यह हमारा कहना है ।

लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से गत कुछ महीनों में और विशेषकर गत सप्ताह में चीजों को छिपाने का जिस प्रकार से प्रयास किया गया, उससे ऐसा लगता है कि जरूर दाल में कुछ काला है और जितना बताया जा रहा है, उससे अधिक गड़बड़ हो सकती है।

वित्त मंत्री द्वारा जो पत्र दिया गया, अब वह पत्र वैसे हो अगर जनता के सामने आता, तो कुछ नहीं होता, लेकिन इसलिए विपक्ष के नेता को पत्र सदन के पटल पर रखना पड़ा और उसके बाद सरकार ने दिया । मैं इस पत्र में अले एक ही परिच्छेद में क्यों न हो, लेकिन जिस प्रकार से इस बजट का उल्लेख हुआ था, मुझे लगता है कि इस प्रकार के बजट का उल्लेख करने की जरूरत वित्त मंत्री को नहीं थी । कर्जा मांगते समय इस प्रकार की करने की जरूरत नहीं थी ।

लेकिन मेरी तीसरी आपत्ति केवल पद्धतियों पर नहीं है । हम उदारीकरण की कल्पना से विरोध नहीं करते हैं, हम लिब्रलाईजेशन के खिलाफ नहीं हैं, लेकिन जब भी किसी नीति का उदारीकरण करते हैं, तो उसे करने में पहले तो उसको हम स्वयं नियंत्रित करें । दुर्भाग्य से यह लगता है कि यह नियंत्रण हमने खो दिया है । कोई और इस उदारीकरण का नियंत्रण करता होगा, तो मुझे लगता है कि देश के लिए आने वाले दिनों में समस्यायें आती हैं।

दूसरे इस उदारीकरण की जो गति है, उस पर भी नियंत्रण चाहिए था । दुनियां का कोई देश ऐसा नहीं है जिसके यहां सौ प्रतिशत मार्केट इकनामी है । जो हमको सलाह देते हैं, उनके पास भी नहीं है । मतलब जापानी कार से आज भी अमरीका डरा हुआ है और जापान किसी और देश

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

से चावल आज भी अपने देश में नहीं आने देता । इसलिए जो उदारीकरण की चरम सीमा तक पहुंचे हुए देश हैं, वह देश भी अपने देश के लोगों के हितों की रक्षा की चर्चा करते हैं और उसके अनुसार उदारीकरण बताते हैं ।

इसीलिए उदारीकरण हम स्वयं नियंत्रित करें । दुर्भाग्य से वह नहीं हो रहा है । उदारीकरण की गति हम तय करें और किसी भी आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति या पूरी अर्थ नीति को खुला करना, इसका भी एक क्रम होता है । अगर उस क्रम के बिना हम धीरे-धीरे न चलते हुए, अगर एकदम सारी अर्थ नीति को उदार कर दें, तो देश के सामने बड़ी व्यापक समस्यायें आयेंगी और उसके साथ-साथ उदारीकरण का क्षेत्र भी जो है, उसे हमको तय करना चाहिए ।

अब कल हमने समाचार-पत्रों में पढ़ा कि हालीवुड की सभी की सभी फिल्में जिनको हिंदुस्तान में आने पर पाबंदी थी, उदारीकरण की नीति में अब कोई भी विदेशी व्यक्ति यहां फिल्में ला सकता है, दिखा सकता है और उसका पैसा ले जा सकता है । अब मुझे लगता है कि एक बार उदारीकरण करते समय हमको तय करना पड़ेगा कि हमको क्या चाहिए । क्या पैप्सी-कोला और कोका-कोला हमारी जरूरतें हैं ? क्या हालीवुड से आने वाली फिल्म हमारी जरूरत है ? हां, और देशों का सहकार लें, इसमें आपत्ति नहीं है । बुद्धि पर किसी एक का एकाधिकार शायद हो नहीं सकता, लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ क्या पेन में, जूते में, पेंट में, तेल में, साबुन में, जो उपभोक्ताओं की वस्तुएं हैं, जो वस्तुएं हम अपने देश में बना सकते हैं, अपने देश का उपयोग कर सकते हैं, दुर्भाग्य से इस स्वदेशी का, इस स्वालंबन का इस राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहीं भी उल्लेख नहीं है । इसलिए उदारीकरण की नीति दुनियां की अर्थ नीति से हमको जोड़ना यह जितना आवश्यक है उसी के साथ इसका नियंत्रण, इसकी गति का निर्धारण और इसके क्षेत्र का चयन, इसमें जो सावधानी हम को बरतनी चाहिए अगर न बरती तो कहीं हमारे लोग कहते हैं कि हम दक्षिण अमरीका की देश की श्रेणी में चले जाएं, मैं नहीं चाहता कि देश का ऐसा दुर्भाग्य आए, लेकिन उस दिशा में अगर हमें जाना नहीं है और उदारीकरण ठीक ढंग से करना है तो उसके प्रति इन सावधानियों की चर्चा दुर्भाग्य से इस नीति में नहीं दिखाई देती । नई उद्योग नीति की चर्चा इस पूरे अभिभाषण में है । उद्योग नीति में आपने अभी अनुमति पत्र की व्यवस्था पूरी समाप्त कर दी है । अब कोई भी व्यवसाय, उद्योग अगर खोलना चाहें तो उसको बार-बार दिल्ली में आकर नार्थ, साउथ ब्लाक के दरवाजे खटखटाना नहीं पड़ेंगे । मुझे लगता है कि यह उचित कदम है । यह कदम भले ही आपके घोषणा-पत्र में लिखा नहीं है लेकिन चूंकि भारतीय जनता पार्टी के घोषणा-पत्र में ही यह कदम लिखा है और अगर उस पर आप अमल कर रहे हैं तो उसमें आपत्ति होने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । क्योंकि जब तक भी यह लाइसेंस परमिट राज था भ्रष्टाचार उसी के कारण पनपा, लाल फीताशाही उसी के कारण आई. अफसरशाही की समस्याएं उसी के कारण आई और इसलिए भ्रष्टाचार, लाल फीताशाही और अफसरशाही, इन तीन महा-राक्षसों को समाप्त करने वाली इस नीति से जरूर देश को लाभ होगा । इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है । लेकिन जब हम नो लाइसेंसिंग सिस्टम को लाते हैं, जब हम लाइसेंस परमिट राज खत्म करते हैं तब उसके कुछ दुष्परिणाम भी होते हैं जिसके प्रति सावधान होना देश की सरकार को आवश्यक है । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नई उद्योग नीति की प्रशंसा तो है लेकिन इसकी प्रशंसा के बाद इसमें आने वाली समस्याओं का कोई जिक्र नहीं है । जब हमारे पास लाइसस परमिट राज था तो उसके सौ दुष्परिणाम थे लेकिन उसका एक अच्छा परिणाम था जिसको आने वाली नीतियों में यत्न करना आवश्यक था । लाइसेंस परमिट के कारण सरकार के हाथ में एक ऐसी ताकत मिलती थी जिसके कारण वह उद्योगों को अविकसित क्षेत्र में, पिछड़े हुए इलाके में भेजने की ताकत रखती थी और उसके कारण देश का पूरा सन्तुलित विकास

होता था । अब जिस दिन हमने नो लाइसेंसिंग सिस्टम लाया, लाइसेंस परमिट राज समाप्त किया उससे लाभ जरूर हुआ, भ्रष्टाचार, लाल फीताशाही, अफसरशाही से खत्म होने के लाभ हुए । लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ जो संतुलित विकास इस देश का होना था उस विकास से अब देश वंचित रह जाएगा। अब कोई भी उद्योगपति उसी क्षेत्र में जाएगा जहां बहुत अच्छी बिजली, जहां फाइव स्टार होटल होंगे, वहां एअरपोर्ट होगा और जहां गरीब इलाके होंगे, पिछड़े इलाके होंगे, आदिवासी क्षेत्र होंगे, पिछड़ी जन जातियों के क्षेत्र होंगे, हर प्रदेश का अविकसित भाग होगा उसमें कोई नहीं जाएगा । अब हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को जब यह नई उद्योग नीति लानी चाहिए उसी समय हमको इस प्रकार के सन्तुलित हिन्दुस्तान के विकास की सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए थी, दुर्भाग्य से इस संबंध में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है और इसलिए केवल नई नीति की प्रशंसा करना यह पर्याप्त नहीं है, उसके साथ उसके जो दोष हैं, उसका निराकरण करना भी आवश्यक है । लघु उद्योग के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा । लघु उद्योग प्रतिशत में ज्यादा है । 80 प्रतिशत है और उदारीकरण अगर बड़े उद्योग के लिए अच्छा है तो लघु उद्योग के लिए क्यों नहीं है ? लाइसेंस परमिट राज्य से अगर हमने बड़े उद्योगों को मुक्त किया है तो छोटे को क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं ।? उनकी सुरक्षा की क्या व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं ? दुर्भाग्य से हमारे यहां जितनी भी बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियां आई हैं, जिस क्षेत्र में हम चाहते हैं उस क्षेत्र में तो बहुत कम आती हैं लेकिन जिस क्षेत्र में उनका आना जरूरी नहीं है ऐसी उपभोक्ताओं की चीजें तैयार करने वाले छोटे-छोटे क्षेत्र में बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों की आवश्यकता नहीं है वहां के लिए आने से जरूर रोकना चाहिए । लेकिन यह तभी होगा जब अगर हम कानून बना दें कि जो भी उपभोक्ता वस्तुएं हैं इसको केवल लघु उद्योग ही तैयार कर सकता है इस प्रकार का कानून बने और लघु उद्योग के सिवा और कोई क्षेत्र अगर उपभोक्ता की छोटी जरूरत की चीजों के बनाने पर जाए तो उस पर कानूनन पाबंदी हो, सजा हो । इस प्रकार का रक्षण उद्योग को हम सुरक्षा देने की व्यवस्था करें तो मुझे लगता है कि बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के जाल से हम हमारे छोटे लोगों को बचा सकते हैं । और जिन क्षेत्रों में बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के आने से देश का हित है, उन क्षेत्रों में उन्हें आने पर मजबूर कर सकते हैं, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि जिस क्षेत्र में बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनी हम चाहते हैं, उसमें वह नहीं आ रही हैं और जिन क्षेत्रों में हम नहीं चाहते हैं, उनमें आ रही हैं । मान लीजिए पोटेटो चिप्स बनाने के लिए किसी विदेशी कंपनी को पूछने की जरूरत नहीं है, वह तो हम घर में बना सकते हैं, लेकिन अगर बिजली बनाने में वह मदद देते हैं तो जरूर दें । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में इसका भी उल्लेख नहीं है ।

मजदूर के बारे में उल्लेख तो है, लेकिन मजदूरों का उल्लेख करते समय नयी नीति से नए रोजगार तो दूर रहे, पुराने रोजगार भी नहीं मिल रहे हैं । वह बेरोजगार हो रहे हैं अपनी नौकरियों से । वह बाहर जा रहे हैं व्यवसाय से तो उसको सुरक्षा देने की कोई चर्चा इस पूरे अभिभाषण में नहीं है । हां, एक जगह जरूर उन्होंने एक वाक्य कहा है जिसमें राष्ट्रपति जी कहते हैं कि, "नई नीतियों के परिणामस्वरूप वर्तमान ढांचे में किए जाने वाले परिवर्तनों से जो कामगार प्रभावित होंगे, उनके हितों की रक्षा करने की आवश्यकता के प्रति पूरी तरह सरकार सजग है ।' मुझे लगता है कि this is the biggest joke of 1992.

मजदूर जो बाहर जा रहे हैं, उनकी सुरक्षा के प्रति सरकार सजग है, यह सोच नहीं है, छोटीसी बात है । लेकिन मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि हिंदुस्तान में आज कैबिनेट लेवल पर मजदूर मंत्री नहीं है । There is no Labour Minister of Cabinet rank.

उद्योग मंत्री भी नहीं है कैबिनेट लेवल पर और दोनों प्रधान मंत्री के पास हैं । मुझे बंबई में एक मजदूर ने कहा, "साल कर दिया आपने उद्योग और मजदूर दोनों

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

एक ही के पास हैं । इसका अर्थ यह हो गया कि जो ट्रेड यूनियन का चेयरमैन है, वही मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर हो जाय आप इस व्यंग्य को छोड़ दीजिए, मैं नहीं मानता, दोनों में अलग-अलग व्यवस्थाएं हैं, लेकिन मजदूरों के प्रति आप कितने उदासीन हैं कि राममूर्ति जी के बाद आपको अभी मजदूर मंत्री पूर्ण समय का नहीं मिला । यह अपने आप में इस बात का प्रमाण है कि आप मजदूरों के प्रति किस तरह से उदासीन हैं ।

अब आपको राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण श्रमिक आयोग की रिपोर्ट तो मिल चुकी है, लेकिन अभी भी आप उसका अध्ययन कर रहे हैं । मुझे पता नहीं, इसका आप कब तक अध्ययन करेंगे ?

आपने रुपए का अवमूल्यन किया । यह एक सबसे महत्वपूर्ण कदम था, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से इस अवमूल्यन के लाभों की चर्चा राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में है ही नहीं क्योंकि इससे कोई लाभ हुआ ही नहीं है । इसलिए अवमूल्यन का कदम उठाने पर राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण खामोश है । यह अपने आप में प्रमाण है कि सरकार को अवमूल्यन से जितने लाभ होने चाहिए थे, वह नहीं हुए ।

मैं यहां नए बजट की चर्चा करना आवश्यक नहीं समझता, लेकिन अधिकृत मूल्य और बाजारू मूल्य के 25 से 30 रुपए की चर्चा जो आप कर रहे हैं, इसे 25 से 30 में भी मान लीजिए तो इसका अर्थ यह है कि हिंदुस्तान के रुपए का और पच्चीस फीसदी अवमूल्यन आपने पीछे के दरवाजे से कर लिया है । इस इतनी बड़ी आर्थिक घटना के ऊपर भी राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में किसी प्रकार का उल्लेख नहीं है ।

इसमें किसान का उल्लेख है, लेकिन आज जो हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ नीति खड़ी हुई है, वह बड़े उद्योगों के कारण नहीं खड़ी हुई है । किसी बड़े उद्योग के निर्यात से हिन्दुस्तान को पैसा नहीं मिलता। हमें 80 प्रतिशत निर्यात का पैसा किसान देता है, लेकिन किसान को उसकी उपज का ठीक भाव मिले, इस तरह की कोई चर्चा राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में नहीं है । इसलिए अगर इन सारी चीजों को देखा जाय तो लगता है कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में जो सारी चीजें हैं, उनमें किसी प्रकार की अर्थ नीति में परिवर्तन जोकि देश के हित में हो, इस प्रकार की चर्चा नहीं है ।

मैं अंतिम मुद्दे को जल्दी खत्म करने का प्रयास करूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में सबसे अधिक 57 में से 25 परिच्छेद विदेश नीति के संबंध में हैं और मुझे कभी-कभी लगता है कि आधा भाषण विदेश मंत्रालय का भाषण है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सौभाग्य है कि मैं जब बोल रहा हूं तो विदेश मंत्री संयोग से सामने बैठे हैं । राष्ट्रपति जी का यह कहना है कि गत भाषण के पश्चात विश्व में घटनाएं तेजी से बदली हैं । यह सच है, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से राष्ट्रपति जी का पिछला अभिभाषण और नया अभिभाषण बिल्कुल नहीं बदला है । पेय भी वही है, बोतल भी वही है, सिर्फ ढक्कन बदला है । गत भाषण में 61 में से 22 परिच्छेद इस विदेश नीति पर थे और इस बार 57 में से 25 हैं लेकिन पढ़ते समय लगता है कि पुराना भाषण फिर लिखा गया है । मालदीव, भूटान, नेपाल, फिजी, जापान, दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया, युरोपियन कंट्रीज, गुट निरपेक्षता, कंबोडिया, इन सारे विषयों पर बस वही लिखा गया है, जो पिछले अभिभाषण में था। अगर पिछले अभिभाषण में वही लिखा था तो इन शब्दों में थोड़ी सी हेराफेरी करके फिर अभिभाषण की लंबाई बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी और जो मूल नीतियां हैं उसके संबंध में कुछ नहीं कहा है । हां, विदेश नीति में सबसे महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय है— इसरायल को राजनीतिक मान्यता । जैसा मैंने पहले ही कहा, इसका हम स्वागत करते हैं, यह हमारी मांग थी, आपने इसको पूर्ण किया । इसमें कोई दुख की बात नहीं है, लेकिन इसका श्रेय आपकी ओर नहीं जाता है ।

अब सोवियत संघ का टूटना इस शताब्दी की सबसे महत्वपूर्ण घटना है। सोवियत संघ हमारा सबसे अधिक निकटतम दोस्त था। सोवियत संघ के साथ हमारा आर्थिक सहकार्य सबसे अधिक था। सोवियत संघ के टूटने से हमारी राजनीतिक और आर्थिक हानि हुई है और इससे नई समस्याएं पैदा हुई हैं। उसका टूटना न हम रोक सकते थे और न जरूरी था। उसका टूटना अपने आपमें वहां की विचाराधारा में लिखा था। मैं उसके टूटने की चिंता नहीं कर रहा हूं, लेकिन उसके प्रभाव जो हम पर हैं उन प्रभाव के बारे में राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण कुछ नहीं कहता। अभिभाषण में किसको मान्यता दी, हमने कहां यात्रा की, हम कहां दूतावास खोलेंगे, बस इसकी चर्चा है। सोवियत संघ टूटने से आपने किसको मान्यता दी, आपने कहां यात्रा की और आपने दूतावास कहां खोले, यह नीति नहीं है, यह तो आवश्यक चीजें हैं, यह नीति नहीं है। दुर्भाग्य से उसके परिणामों के प्रति यह सत्य लगता नहीं है। इसीलिए मुझे यह लगता है कि जो भी विदेश-नीति के बारे में कहा गया है, नई चीजें नहीं हैं।

महोदय, जो छूटें हैं, उसका मैं एक-एक वाक्य में उल्लेख करुंगा। गत अभिभाषण में चीन के साथ जो हमारा सीमा-विवाद था, उसकी चर्चा थी, लेकिन इस अभिभाषण में सीमा-विवाद के उस परिच्छेद को बाहर कर दिया है। मुझे पता नहीं है कि यह जानबूझकर हुआ है या अनजाने में हुआ है। इसका क्या अर्थ हो सकता है? गुट-निरपेक्ष आंदोलन की तो मैं प्रासंगिकता समझ ही नहीं सकता। दुनियां जब गुटों में बंटी थी तो निर्गुट का मतलब था, लेकिन अब जब दुनियां गुटों में है ही नहीं, तो निर्गुट क्या है? जब गुट नहीं तो हम निर्गुट कैसे? यह आज तक समझ में नहीं आता। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि संस्था को छोड़ दो। आखिर जो भी संस्था इस दुनियां में पैदा होती है तो उसका चलना आवश्यक बन ही जाता है। लेकिन, हम अपने अभिभाषण में कहें कि इसकी स्थायी प्रासंगिकता है और इससे देश का भला, कल्याण होगा तो मुझे लगता है कि यह गलत होगा।

इस बार राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में अणु-अस्त्र प्रसार के संबंध में उल्लेख है। अणु-अस्त्र मुक्त क्षेत्र के संबंध में अंशतः या खण्डतः विचार नहीं किया जा सकता, राष्ट्रपति जी के इस विचार से हम सहमत हैं, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से इसमें पाकिस्तान को आणविक शक्ति का कोई उल्लेख नहीं है। वैसे भी कांग्रेस के घोषणा-पत्र को देखा जाए तो, पाकिस्तान अगर आणविक शस्त्र निर्माण करेगा तो अपनी नीति के बारे में हम पुनर्विचार करेंगे, इस प्रकार का स्पष्ट उल्लेख इस घोषणा-पत्र में है। मुझे यह लगता है कि समय आ गया है, जब पाकिस्तान आणविक शक्तिधारी हो चुका है, वह अनुशस्त्र धारी बन चुका है और पाकिस्तान के साथ चार लड़ाइयों का हमारा पिछला इतिहास देखते हुए हिंदुस्तान को सतर्क रहना चाहिए। यहां तक ही नहीं स्वयं का अणुबम बनाने की दिशा में यत्नवत कदम उठाना चाहिए और हमें भी अणु-अस्त्रधारी देश में आ जाना चाहिए। इस प्रकार की विदेश नीति में कोई नई चीज करने की आवश्यकता है।

महोदय अमेरिका के बारे में पिछले अभिभाषण से इस अभिभाषण में बहुत ही अच्छा और ज्यादा कहा गया है। कभी-कभी लगता है कि अमेरिका के बारे में इतना अच्छा इसके पहले के राष्ट्रपति के किसी अभिभाषण में नहीं आया होगा। अमेरिका से हम जरूर अच्छे संबंध चाहते हैं, जो राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का आशय है, उससे हम सहमत हैं, लेकिन इसी के साथ-साथ सोवियत संघ का टूट जाना, दुनियां के दो गुटों का एक ही स्तम्भ पर आ जाना, अमेरिका की ताकत इतनी बढ़ जाना, इसके प्रति भारत जैसे विशाल देश को आंखें नहीं मूंद लेनी चाहिएं। हमारी विदेशनीति तय करते समय इस नई

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियों में हमको सोचना पड़ेगा और केवल हम अपनी विदेश-नीति को पड़ौसी देशों तक ही सीमित न रखें। आज की स्थिति में, सोवियत संघ टूट जाने के बाद, भारत की भूमिका और बड़ी है, उसका उल्लेख, उसका आशय राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में होता तो अच्छा होता। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अंत में मैं तो केवल इतना ही

3.00PM

कहना चाहता हूं कि भले ही अपने अभिभाषण में राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा हो कि चुनौतियों को अवसरों में बदलो लेकिन स्वयं राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण एक खोए हुए अवसरों की कहानी है। यह अभिभाषण चुनौतियों से लड़ने की प्रेरणा नहीं देता, यह चुनौतियों से दूर भागने का प्रयास है।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने यह विश्वास प्रकट किया है अपने अंतिम परिच्छेद में कि हम विवेकशील और बुद्धिमतापूर्ण विचार-विमर्श करेंगे। अगर राष्ट्रपति जी की यह सलाह माननी है कि हम विवेकशील और बुद्धिमतापूर्ण निर्णय करें तो मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कह सकता हूं कि उनके इस अभिभाषण के लिए आभार का जो ज्ञापन का प्रस्ताव है उसका अगर हम समर्थन करें तो हमारा यह कदम विवेकशील और बुद्धिमतापूर्ण नहीं होगा और चूंकि राष्ट्रपति जी चाहते हैं कि विवेकशील और बुद्धिमतापूर्ण निर्णय हम लें, मैं इस आभार का समर्थन नहीं कर सकता, इसके लिए मुझे खेद है। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this Motion proposed by hon. Shri Ram Naresh Yadav to thank the hon. President for the Address which he has delivered to both the Houses of Parliament on 24th of Februay. This support, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not supporting just because I am sitting on this side of the House. I am supporting this because this was very inspiring. I am supporting this because I have applied the required intelligence. Mr. Pramod Mahajan said that because he applied his intelligence he could not support it. I am supporting it because I hvae applied my intelligence in the right direction.

Sir, before I come to the main subject of the speech, I would like to make an observation that most of the friends on the other side have tried to support and not to support also. They went on saying like Pramod Mahajanji in every sentence, this is a good scheme, this is a good sentence this is a good proposal, but there is a problem. It means that everything is good, but he is objecting because he is sitting there. It is his duty to object.

I appreciate his duty. He has tried his best to prove that even if everything is right, it requires something more. I am with him on this that even if everything is good, there is scope for improvement. His suggestions, I am sure, our Government will definitely look into. But, basically, everything has been rightly said. The policies have been presented in the right direction. Similarly other friends have been objecting to it for the sake of objection. None of them has given really any concrete suggestions.

F01 example, the National Front and the Left Front people boycotted the President's Address. I just cannot find any logic behind it. In my opinion, Sir, a quitter can never be a winner. They can never win. Because they knew that they were not going to win, they wanted probably to get a political mileage out of it. One of my friends on the other side, discussed with me about this just before this President's Address. He said, "We are going to disturb the President's Address." I requested him with folded hands, "Don't do this. This is a very solemn occasion. You must not only attend, but you must listen to the President's peacefully, and then, if requited, you can put your views in Pariament

This is the normal practice." I appreciate that on my efforts at last he agreed, "All right. We will not disturb the President's Address." I am thankful to them for they have not disturbed the Address.

But what did they gain by boycotting it ? Did they get any political mileage ? By the "Ekta Yatra" they wanted to get a political mileage. They got nothing. The NF and the LF wanted a political mileage out of boycotting the President's Address. They could not get it. Unfortunately, people in the Opposition today in any of the parties, have no issues left. The Government is functioning with a direction which is good for the country in every respect. Since they have notliing else to do, for everything they are either trying to boycott or trying to object for the sake of objection.

I could not understand how they could know what the President was going to say in his Address. On the Finance Minister's letter to the IMF, whether it was leaked or it was not leaked, a big issue was made about our relations with the World Bank and the IMF. How could they know what the President was going to speak about ? Before that they withdrew. When we talk about the letter addressed to the World Bank, what has the Government disclosed ? If you go on discussing every point—I would here refer to three or four points—you will see that those points _ were necessaiy. They were the policies of the Government long before it was discussed with the World Bank or the IMF. If something which the Government is going to do is good and if it is the same view of the World Bank or the IMF, what is wrong in it ? When they made a hue and cry, I thought, let me find out what has been leaked in the Budget. I tried to check with a number of friends ; I tried to look into the letter also, which was finally placed, of course, on the Table of the House. I tried my best. Nothing was leaked.

I Could not know anything as to what was going to come in the Budget. They made a hue and cry. They wasted hours and hours and days and days only on one issue that we have sold the country; we have leaked everything and the Budget was of no use. Can anyone guide me even today based on that letter that what was leaked in the Budget was because of that letter ? Nothing was leaked. On the other hand, Mahajan Ji said very rightly that they did not come to us, we went there. I would say, yes, we went there. Our Government went there. We needed money. But, the question is why did we go there. Why was this situation created ? We have to look into this aspect ? Till 1989, we never had his kind of a problem. What happened in 1989? We lost the credibility of the country. I would like to point out on this subject of credibility. In any financial world, the credibility is the most important subject. The movement the former hon. Prime Minister Mr. Singh came into power or the National Front came to power, they started crying from the roof-tops that the coffers were empty. If the coffers were empty, naturally who will support you ? The credibility of the country was lost. It was brougt to the lowest level. If it was lowest at the lowest level, what are you going to get from anywhere in the world ? Not only this, they mismanaged the economy of the country to a level where they did not know how to make income. They went on spending money lavishly and carelessly for mesures which did not develop the country, but the measures were there only to give doles. We came to a point where the country was bankrupt. The country had to send gold out of the country. Why ? This was not done by the Congress Government. This was done because of the mismanagement of the economy for 18 months. It is the Congress Government which came to power and it is the Congress Government which brought back all the gold from that country. Nobody wants to appreciate this..

[Shri. Santosh Bigrodiaj

Nobody has put a single word of appreciation. They only said whatever the Congress is doing, whatever the President has said is wrong. Or, if it is right, as Pramod Mahajan said, it is not absolutely right. When we go there, naturally they will ask for conditions. What was wrong in the conditions ? At least it is much better than the money received by leftist parties about whom I said about two or three days ago in Parliament. At least this money is given overboard. The money which is coming from the World Bank, the IMF or any international organisation is going to be used for the benefit of the country, but I would like to know the account of the money which the Russians have given to the leftist parties. Crores and crores, millions and millions of dollars have been received during the last 40 or 50 or 60 years.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN- They must have given in Roubles.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA* No, It had come in terms of dollars. Roubles were convert into dollars and then this money came into India, I would like to know from my friends, can they give an account of that money which is given to them.

....(व्यवधान) आपको कुछ बोलना है बहन जी, तो आप बोलिये। आप बता दीजिये उसके एकाउंट्स को, मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी। मुझे बोलना ही नहीं पड़ेगा।

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): मैंने आपके लिये कुछ कहा ही नहीं। मैं प्रमोद जी से बात कर रही थी। ....(व्यवधान)

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: तो आप मंजूर करती हैं कि करोड़ों रुपया डालर्स के रूप में, रुबल्स के रूप में आपके पास पहुंच रहा है, आपकी पार्टी के पास आया है और वह भी अंडर हैंड आया है जिसमें कि फैरा का रूल भी वॉयलेट हुआ...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी: इन्होंने बिना बात सुने ही साबित कर दिया।

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: मैंने तो कुछ नहीं कहा। मैं तो वही कह रहा हूं जो कि रशियंस बोल रहे हैं, मैं तो वही बोल रहा हूं। उस दिन भी मैंने बताया कि यह तो रशियंस बोल रहे हैं कि हमने इंडिया को कम्युनिस्ट पार्टीज को करोड़ों रुपया हर महीने दिया है, हर साल दिया है और 70 बरस से देते चले आ रहे हैं...(व्यवधान)

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): कभी आपके समर्थन के लिए दिया, कभी आपके विरोध के लिए दिया।

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: हमें तो मालूम ही नहीं था कि रुपया दिया है ...(व्यवधान) मैं अपनी बात कह रहा हूं। अब यह रुपया क्यों दिया, कैसे आया, इस रुपया का क्या उपयोग हुआ, यह कोई नहीं जानना चाहता। यह कोई बताने को तैयार नहीं है। इसमें फैरा का वॉयलेशन हुआ कि नहीं, यह नहीं बताएंगे। But they will always say "Why have you sold our country to IMF ? What do we gain by IMF money ?" What we gain is development for the country. Every pie which will come to this country...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.A. BABY): I think the issue raised by the Member is a very serious matter and the Government should come out with a statement, whether some parties have received money from the former USSR. The Government should bring out all relevant matters.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : The Prime Minister will reply to it.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWA-RAJ (Haryana) : The Minister for External Afiairs is sitting here and he should react to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.A. BABY) * Government should come out with all this information.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member has just now put it on record that whatever foreigners say about this country is correct—if Russians say they have given us money it is correct, if Bofors say they have piven bribe it is correct. He is saying we should rely on foreigners. He is putting on record what has been in doubt all these months and years. He wants to confirm that we must listen to the Swedish company and the Russians. I do not subscribe to the theory and I do not think that we should believe foreigners either Bofors or the Russians. But he wants to believe them.

श्री राम नरेश यादव :(उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, जो बात माननीय सदस्य ने कही और उधर से जो आपत्ति आई है, तो प्रधानमंत्री जब उत्तर देंगे, उस समय सारी बातें आ जाएंगी।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, माननीय सदस्य ने जो प्रश्न उठाया है, विदेश मंत्री यहां बैठे हैं, वे रिएक्ट करें इस पर।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : विदेशों से पैसा आने के बारे में तो विदेश मंत्री को ही पता होगा। यह तो सीधा-सीधा सवाल है, और किसी डिपार्टमेंट का तो है नहीं।

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, 1 appreciate your stand that the Government should corn's out with all the facts and figures about these underhand dealings that Russians have sent money to the Communist party. I still maintain the same stand. Since my good friend, Mr. Morarka has mentioned about trusting the foreigners, whether it is Bofors or anybody else, it is they who trusted them.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I just now put it on record. I strongly obejct. I do not beileve either them or anybody else. But he cannot differentiate. If he has chosen to use the debate on the President's Address to make a charge which no responsible person should make in this august House, then he must see himself in the mirror. He represents the party which has brought shame to the country, who have been told that they have taken bribes and it does not lie in their mouth to accuse other political parties of getting money. That is all I wanted to remitted him. If he still wants to carry on the debate at this level, I am ready.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Now you please con-tiune.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, without my yielding, if you allow everybody to speak like this I have no objection. I will continue to reply to his question.
(Interruptions) ..... If he is continuing to go on replyine .....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Please don't interrupt him.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Let him reply when his turn comes. I will be too glad to listen to him very peacefully. So far as our Congress party is concerned, we have made our stand very clear whether it is Bofors or the Communist party or whatever has happened, if any bribes have been given that should come out. We tried our best. They were in power for 18 months. They could not do anything. The matter remained at the same level. Only on hearsay basis they tried to hang our officers and our leaders. It is they who have brought shame to the country by trusting one individual, who himself is responsible for all this who has taken the money for himself. He is a businessman and 1 can convince him some day, if he wants to be convinced with an open mind. It is Mr. Ardbo who has taken all the money to his house. Nothing has come into India. But he will never believe it. I know he will never believe it because it

[Shri Santosh Bagrodia]

does not suit him to believe it. But as far as the money for the Communis Party is concerned, this has all come under-hand. Our Foreign Minister does not know. He does not do any underhand thing. It has not come through the Government channels. It has come underhand. It is for the Communist Party themselves or our CBI or some other enquiry system as the Government decides upon to find out that. Mr. Vice- Chairman, Sir, I appreciate your ruling or your advise to the Government to come our with a statement *on* this particular subject because this is a very important matter which should be known to the countrymen. How that money was coming to the communists from Russia for the last 60 or 70 years?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA:" Bagrodiaji, will you please yield for a moment? The hon. External Affairs Minister is sitting here as well as the other Ministers of the Government. The charge which has been levellec against a political party by the Member is a very serious charge. At least one response which one expects from the Government is that they will inquire into this matter. This cannot be left at this level. Will the External Affairs Minister, who is sitting here, at least respond by saying that they will inquire into this matter and come to the House with whatever is the truth?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): The External Affairs Minister is here.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI): Sir, I did not speak because it was explanied that the point was taken note of and the Prime Minister, while replying, would say whatever he might have to say about this matter.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Mr.. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am coming back to- the letter which was given to the World Bank or the IMF. This is the normal practice. Even if we take a small loan from a bank, how do we act? We go to the manager. We discuss with him. We give our proposals. The proposals are discussed for months together. Once we say come to a real understanding he says," This is how it should be done, this is what we will permit." We have to show how we are going to work with the money the bankers are going to give us. Then we give that kind of a letter and the bankers confirm it. What is wrong in it if a letter has been given on those lines to the World Bank laso?

Similarly, Sir, when we think of the "Industrial Policy, it says, "Limit industrial licensing decisions toloca-tional grounds. Raise the limits of capital goods import." These items whicn I am talking bout are not even fulfilled. But they are shouting. We have assured, of course. These *are* the policies which have been highlighted everywhere in our manifesto also. This is what is going to happen. These are what our Ministers and Government are talking about. They talk about open policies. What have we opened ? You have to look at it from all these angles. Mr. Gurupadaswamy said-he is not here right now—that there was a crisis. I think because of this Government, we have opened politically. That is why we had elec-tions in place like the Punjab. We have opened economically. What is wrong in it ? There is now a premium on efficiency. So far, there was a premium on inefficiency. Now, thers will be no corruption or there will be less corruption. Earlier, because of the permit raj', there was heavy corruption. The Government is opening all these things. Because of that, people will be better off; people will get more jobs. I will come to this aspect later. Now, everything is opening up. There are human rights in the country today which we not there before. What is wrong in it ? You are getting more

and more powers. You are getting more opening. The Government has opened more. Still you are crying, "No, it is not good." What has happened to our Industrial Policy ? "Deregulate the steel industry." Yes, that. has been deregulated. How has it affected the steel price? Has if gone up very much high ? I do not think so It has not gone up very high. The demand and supply position will certainly play its role. If there is a heavy demand, naturally the price will go up. If there is no demand, the price will go down. Why do you want to have artificial shortages or artificial surpluses ? Let there be natural shortage, if there is one. and natural surplus. Amend the sick industrial Companies Act and lengthen your BIFR." What is wronginit? You are strengthening the BIFR. It says Specify details of the working of National Renewal Fund". What was wrong in it ? It says : "Specify industrial restructuring modalities based on ecommendations of Inter-mi material Group." What is wrong in this Industrial Policy ?

Similarly, if you come to Trade Policy, it says, "Remove RBI restrictions relating to casnh margins queuing system for L/Cs and capital goods financing requirement. What was happening ? You go to the bank, the L/cs will not be opened for 30 days. They says no, mere should be no queue. Theor margin was 250 per cent *in* 1990-91. The margin for opening a letter of credit went up as high has250percent which is unheard of in the world. This is what happened. This is now being removed What more do you want? Further, it says, "Move intermediate goods on restricted imports list *to* OGL or to Exim scrip route; reduos/ eliminate forex allocation to Government canalizing agencies withine phasing out of dual pricing of previously decanalised items , decanalisation of all but a few acceptable" products. If private importers use Exim scrip for an item,

ask Government agencies to do the same. Abolish "actual user" requirement for imports." Again, Sir, as a small industrialist myself I know what was the significance of the actual user requirement for imports, it was also a kind of per-mt raj. People used to import actually. Yes, actual user- was expected to be for that purpose. But everything was going somewhere else. Then it says, "abolish Limited Permissible List of Import and Export Policy." Now, there is no import-export control. I am told that the OCIE will be closed. But. it is partially fulfilled. It is not fulfilled so far. Then it says, "remove DGS&D price preference to domestic suppliers. Except for a satisfactory negative list, remove all export licensing, canalisation and minimum export prices; reduce customs tariffs substantially in the 1992-93 Budget."

Now, I come to Financial Markets and Institutions. It says : "Reduce Statutory Liquidity Ratio for banks." This has been partially fulfilled. It has not been fulfilled fully. It says further. "Reduce priority sector lending." It has not been fulfilled. The priority sector lending will continue, is continuing and I am sure, it will always continue as long as the people who take the loans, also understand the responsibility of accepting loans 1ike that. It is not an aid It is a loan which fact must be understood. Then it says, "Give SEBI statutory powers". It has partially been fulfilled. Then, "Reform Trading machanism of stork exchanges. Introduce national clearing and settlement and set up central depositor" trust. "This has partially been fulfilled. "Allow mutual funds in private sector"—'partially fulfilled.

Now, I come to Public Enterprises Reform. Here it says, "Reduce budgetary support and loans to public sector. Elimainate such support by 1994-95." This has partially been fulfilled. What is wrong in it ? I will request my friends to be a

[Shri Santosh Bagrodia]

little hatient" Initiate restructuring ana closure procedures for unviable public sector units ? This has patialry been fulfilled. Then it says, "Amend Sick Industrial Companies Act to refer sick PSUs to BIFR." Now, the BIFR is not a private institution. It is an institution which belongs to the Government.. The Government is regulating it and if the PSUs are also referred to the BIFR, then what is wrong in it ? We will get an expert-advice from the BIFR on the PSUs also. Then it says, "Finalise disinvestment of 20 per cent equity in selected PSUs by end of 1991-92; initiate programme to increase private equity in profitable PSUs to 49 per cent within three years." Now, what are the points which are going to harm the interest of the country ? Instead of saying that this speech was not right, the policies are not right, it is not going to end anywhere, this is not going to lead us anywhere, I will request them to give some specific advice.

Sir, our Finance Minister, in spite of provocation, maintained calmness and silence. The new Industrial Policy is market-oriented or consumer-oriented. What was happening ? Earlier the Consumers Act was not there. Now we have the Consumers Act-. It is one of the best in the world. Even the Britishers have taken a copy of our Consumers Act for reference. If we make use of it properly, a lot of our problems will be removed. Everyday, every now and then, in the Parliament, we talk about telephones.

A number of MPs from both sides went *to* the Telephone Minister recently. They said, "Our money is being cut from our pay." Why ? Because there is no consumer protection. Earlier also, there was marginal consumer protection. Now we have a Consumer Protection Act. PSUs are also covered under tits Act. We want economy of surpluses. Where can the consumer get what he wants? At the right price, of the righ. quality ; instead of the consumer getting what the seller wants ; an administered price, a right quality product. This has got to be stopped sooner or later.

The world is a small village. If you don't do this now and if my friends on the.other side don't support it, we will come back to the eighteenth century; we will not reach the twenty-first century The world will go far ahead of India, unless we come to our sences, unless we see a writing en the wall or what has been happening in the world. We cannot be kept isolated. We have to go with the world. We have to go far ahead of the wouId. We have to move faster than the other developing countries; then only can we do much better for the, masses. What is going to happen ? I appreciate it when today morning I found that BJP has issued a whip to its Members to vote for its amendments. There are only two amendments mentioned in the *Indian Express* or whatever they have said, two amendments on price-rise-and unemployment. I appreciate it. I am with the BJP on this particular subject that price-rise and unemployment are very important factors. I would request my friends in the BJP to tell us whether, by having a cut motion or everybody against this, it is going to help the country. What are we going to achieve ? You please give us definite suggestions. Let us understand how employment is going to increase and let us also understand how the price is going to come down. The price will come down only if we have enough supplies. How can we get enough supplies ? We can get enough supplies if there is more production. How can we get mere production ? We can get more production if there is efficient production. Unless we have people coming in from all over the world, producing the right quality for the consumers, enough production, how does the price corns down? For that if you want to put a restriction, what will happen? Earlier the inflation rate had gone

o 16 per cent. Now the Finance Minister said that this year it would be 6 per cert. What more do you want ? It is coming down. Give us enough time. We have just started taking over from the mess which had been created during the last six months. Give us at least some time to prove that the prices are coming down. Mr. Mahajan said this about the postcard also. I cannot understand why he mentioned it. He is a very intelligent person and a good friend of mine. Postcard prices are still the same, Sir, I wish he had mentioned diesel 1 He did mention it, but diesel prices have not gone up in spite of the rupee devaluation. This is what has to be appreciated. Ail these years diesel and petroleum prices were going up. This year they have not gone up. The kerosene prices have not gone up. This is what has to be appreciated, instead of simply saying that in hundred days we will move a magic wand and everything will come down. Yes, we had tried to maintain the prices at a level which was reasonably correct, which was reasonably possible, for the economy of the country. This is how the prices will come down. Whether you have the amendments or you don't have the amendments, the prices are coming down It is only the Congress Government which will bring the prices down. And if anything happens to this Government, it is not the Congress Party which is going to suffer, but it is the country which is going to suffer and you will be one of them. My friends on the other side will also be suffering as much as everybody else in the country.

And then the country is not going to spare you. Be careful. Let these people work, let this Government work and then see the results. Instead of trying to threaten, instead of trying to find ways of creating further jobs in the country, let it work for some more time. Simi lar is the case in employment. How will more employment be generated Only if more industries are established, whether they are multinationals or otherwise. What has happened in some States ? I want to go back to the fifties or the sixties. There were a number of States which had put a restriction that only a local man will have 51% share; then only they will allow outside people even if he is an Indian. Those States are still in the 'fifties; they are still in the, sixties. They could not develop like Maharashtra; they could not develop like Gujarat; they could not develop like Karnataka; they could not develop like Tamil Nadu. Why? Because they put restrictions which were illogical. I went on explaining to those politicians with folded hands, "Let everybody come- They are going to bring money. They are going to invest money. They are going to create more employment. After all, they are not going to run away with those properties. After that you do what you like, you govern them. But don't put restrictions because of which they don't come here." This is what was happening in our country. We put restrictions. We will not let people come in. I fully agree with Mahajanji. He has not mentioned it. May be, he has got this idea that we should not put this kind of restrictions on industries to be brought in by NRIs and foreigners. I am with him on this. We should not have any objection if anybody in the world wants to come here and put up new units which do not require very, very high technology. I fully agree. But still we want to put restrictions, it is a question of survival— the survival of the efficient, the survival of the fittest. If you are a good speaker obviously you will get better marks. If I am not I cannot get better marks. I cannot say, "Look, I must get 80 % marks" because he is a better speaker. It doesn't happen like this. You will survive, not me. If you have

[Shri Santosh Bagrodia]

better points you will survive, not me. But if I have better points, if I am speaking better I will survive, not you. That is what is to be just understood. Jobs will be created only if there is more production more industries, more business, more trade more development of tourist spots in India. I was discussing with the Tourism Minister this morning that every corner of this country is full of tourist spots. Even in African countries you can go in safaris. See, how much development they have made; how much foreign exchange they have earned by that. What do you lose? Why don't you develop? Why don't you open up? Let them come. They put a 500-room or 1000-room hotel. Do you think after some time they will take away the entire building back to USA or to London or to anywhere else ? It will be there. The people who will be employed will be from India. Even if they want they cannot bring any body from outside. What is wrong in it? They are bringing money. Don't give them any money fiom India. *(Interruptions)...* .If some freinds doubt themselves, if they do not have enough confidence in themselves, they will be hijacked. I don't doubt myself. I don't doubt Indians. I don't doubt the country. I don't want to compare with what happened about 300 or 400 years ago. If we are thinking of the past we just don't think of India; we don't think of our own future; we don't think of the future of our children. That is why I say to the BJP Members that the only way to bring the prices down is through the two methods which I have already explained, that is, only by increased production by more industries and by more investments in all sectors of the economy.

Sir, as far as labour is concerned—with which I am very much concerned'—if there is any kind of unemployment there will be chaos in the country. We cannot afford to retrench a single worker. I understand this problem. No industrial worker should be retrenched. It is clearly stated, about the new industrial policy on labour that:

> "A Standing Tripartite committee has been constituted to examine the impact of the New Industrial Policy on Labour... '

Please give them some time. This Standing Tripartite Committee will definitely come out with something very good. They will find out a way. So far no labourer has been retrenched because of the Industrial Policy. Our Prime Minister has given assurance after assurance that there will no retrenchment. But if you try to shout every second "No, there will be unemployment; there will be retrenchment" then nobody can help us. Nobody can help you. Please give them time. When this Committee's report will come, they will decide how to go about it.

Sir, I am very particular that there should be no subsidy for the industries. Mr. Mahajan has asked how we go to the remote areas. Yes. This is a very important point. How do we go to border areas? How do we go to areas where all the facilities are not available? It is for this reason, I have been saying for the last many years that we should not give subsidy to industry. Sir, about Rs. 25 lakhs is going to the backward areas. It does not attract any industrialist. What we have to do is to develop infrastructure. It is clearly mentioned that the Eighth Plan will also focus on stengthening infrastructure. How is it to be proved? If you see the budgetary provisions, you will find the maximum increase in communication and energy. This is all infrastructure. If we have enough telephones in remote areas, there is no reason why people will not go there. If power is available in remote areas, if roads are there if schools are available in the distant areas, I don't find any pro--blem in getting people going to such areas.

Sir, I would like to say one more thing which I read in newspapers that British Gas is coming to Bombay for distribution. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to this point. At least in these kinds of things where high-tech is not required there can be small conditions so as to benefit other areas also. For example when British gas comes to Bombay that must go to Agartala where Gas is available, so that they can also get its advantage. But they should be committed to develop all the remote areas of north-eastern region where gas is available. If some small conditions are fulfilled, I am sure the international agencies will accept it and the remotest areas in the country will also develop.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan) in the Chair.]

Madam, it is mentioned thai the increase in outlay on transport is 22.5 per cent. It is 34.5 per cent on communications. On industry and minerals it is 22.2 per cent and on energy it -is 22.2 per cent This is how ------

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Mr. Bagrodia, you have taken 36 minutes. Please conclude.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Madam, give me 10 more minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN);
There are several other speakers who want to speak.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Please give me a few more minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Kindly conclude. Mr. Bagrodia, please make your concluding remarks because there are several other speakers. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA : She is the Vice-Chairman and she is authoritative. And she is my sister. All the reasons are there. How can she control me ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): I am making a humble request.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA:
I also have a request to the hon. Finance Minister. I don't know whether 1 will get a chance to speak on the budget or not cotton is an employment-oriented agro based industry. We have an increased duty on cotton. Cotton yarn should be considered like tea and jute which are agro-based industries. Something should be done about that also.

Now I come to the political side. Madam, my friend sitting on the other side has mentioned Assam. Shri Gurupadaswamy in his speech said that the people of Assam were being ill treated. I belong to Assam as much as I belong to Rajasthan and I can assure him that Assamese have never felt ill treated. We should praise our Prime Minister. We should praise the Congress Government that is installed there, for today the ULFA has stopped its activities there. People from all over the country come and go there. I agree, the Bodo problem is there, but it has developed only recently. Now, at least we have a democratic process there. People are living there peacefully. Today I can go to Assam which was not possible one or two months back. Coming to Punjab, I remember the day when Mr. V.P. Singh went to Amritsar in an open jeep a few hundred yards. I immediately thought of Nehru.

Nehru used to travel in an open jeep the length and breadth of this country. I wish those days would be back again. But what happened after that? Mr. V.P. Singh did not

[Shri Santosh Bagrodia] visit Punjab after that even in a closed jeep. Mr. Narasimha Rao saw to it that elections were held in the State. It is complained that there was only 21 to 22 per cent turn-out. But I would like to inform my learned freinds on the other side that in America, only 25 per cent people vote in all elections. Only 25 per cent people vote there and even then the President of America is condsidered to be the most important person in the world. He is the President of the largest democratic country in the world. Here we had a turn-out of 21 per cent. What is the normal practice in all our by-elections? We have a turn-out of 40 to 42 per cent. If one particular party did not vote or decided to boycott, does it mean that we should deprive the others of their rights? Instead of appreciating, if we go on criticising like my friends from the Leftist parties and especially from the National Front are doing, I am afraid we will not be doing justice. Our Prime Minister is trying to bring the situation under control and we should help him in his endeavours. Now, about Jammu and Kashmir, I will not go into great detail. During October, 1989,1 was in Srinagar and I did not face any problem. I had even been to Gulmarg. But from 1989 November onwards, what to speak of me, people who were living there have left the city. Lakhs of people have left the city. Is the Congress Party responsible for this? Whenever a weak Government is installed, Whenever the authority is week, people will try to take advantage of the situation and that is what has happened there. When the National Front Government came to power in Jammu and kashmir, they Went on making themselves more and more powerful and as a result, today, there are lakhs and lakhs of refugees within the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Please conlcude. You have already taken 43 minutes. So, please make your concluding remarks.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Madam, please don't remind me about the minutes that 1 have taken. Let it remain underground for some time. I would like to mention one more point about the refugees. No doubt it is a political issue, and all said and done we should see that for the refugees, whichever commu nity they may belong to, we should create such a situation so that they can go back to their State. But what I don't understand is why the bankers are not letting them withdraw their money or why they are not accepting their drafts. Why is it that the insurance people are not insuring their properties in Srinagar ? This aspect needs to be looked into.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): You can talk on whatever you like. But there is no time.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA : With these, I will only say my last point which is very important tor our coming generations, that is, on the environment. This Government and this Presidential Address has also mentioned about environ-ment. The President's Address says about environmental accountability - environmental accountability not only for everybody, but for the Government, for industry and for people that is, for everybody, there should be an environmental accountability. Do we want our coming generations to live m peace, to live healthy or you want them to live with masks in every nooK and corner or the country ? This is the responsibility which the Government has taken and it is fox this reason the National River Action plan is working in full swing, the river water should be shared by all Indians. Let there be no trouble in sharing of water from the rivers.

I know that you are getting impatient and I will not like you to ring the bell again and again, with these words, I thank you very rnuch for giving me this opportumty.

AN HON. MEMBER : He has not supported the motion.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA : My friend has come a little later I started with saying that I am rising to support. I support whole-hartedly. And all the way, I support the motion.

SHRI YASHWANT, SINHA (Bihar) : Madam Vice-Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion which has been moved by my esteemed colleague Shri Ram Naresh Yadav. I would like to give my presentation with a story Tike my friend, Gurupada-swamyji. This is a story of two friends who had a bet. And what was the bet about ? The bet was, one of them told the other friend, "Tomorrow morning, the sun is going to rise not from the east but from the west"- and since it was such an impossible bet, his friend taking pity on him told him later in the evening, "Tomorrow when the sun rises m the east, you are going to lose the bet. So, why don't change your mind and let us cancel the bet? This friend of his said, "1 will lose the bet only if I accept what you are saying. If I don't accept what you are saying, then, I am not going to lose the bet even if the sun rises in the east and I say it is the west from where the lun rises. That is the end of it and si don't lose the bet." I think we are involved in a similar exercise here.

SHRI DAYANAND SAHAY (Bihar) : Who is that friend who told you this?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Sir, most respectfully, you.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : _ Does it mean that he has no brain?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : I leave it to You. That is your internal party matter. I don't want to tamper with it.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI : That is because he is also a Biharian."

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Madam Vice-Chairman, I started with a story because as we go along in this debate, the relevance of this will become more and more clear. I will make a begning from where my freind, Pramod Mahajan, 1 ft and I am taking advantage of the presence of the Foreign Minister n this House. I am sure he is bere not only in his capacity as a Member of this House but also perhaps because he is on roster duty. Taking advantage of this, I will begin from what the President has said in his Address as the objective of the foreign policy and since I am very stunned by this statement, I am making a beginning with this* The President in his Address, has said, "The Government's foreign policy priorities are to maintain the unity and territorial integrity of India." this is the objective of the foreign policy, that is, to maintain the unity and territorial integrity of this country. If this is the objective of our foreign policy, then what is the objective of our domestic policy? I am absolutely amazed that such words should be put into the mouth of the Presidnet. But the point is that on the foreign policy front we seem to be just drifting alone. A number of events have taken place in this totally and dramatically changed environment and we don't seem to be able to cope with them. Take just one instance. We seem to be overjoyed at the fact that we are now inching closer towards the USA we are forging closer relations with the United States of America and that Pakistan seems to be drifting away from it. And we are very happy about it. We are forging a new relationship with the USA in the military field. Everyday in the newspapers we read about the visit of some US General or some official of the US of Pentagon. We read about this certificate being given to us by the US authorities that certificate being given to us by the

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

US authorities and we are overjoyed by the fact that they say something which is not very nice about Pakistan. Is this a new option that we are exercising ? Was not this policy option available to us right from 15th August, 1947 ? Between India and Pakistan, if we wanted to go under the wing of the USA then that option was there with us all the time from day one. It is not some thing which is available to us today. I am sure the Americans would have always wanted India to be their client State rather than Pakistan. It is only because we decided to follow an independent and non aligned policy that the Americans had to turn to Pakistan. And now the whole thing is being reversed quietly, in a very very clandestine manner and much is being made of it. We are repeatedly saying that we shall talk about our relationship with Pakistan under the Simla Pact, under the framework of the agreement which was reached at Simla. What is the Simla Agreement ? The Simla Agreement is that we shall talk bilaterally with Pakistan and we shall not involve a third party either directly or indirectly. When that be so then why are you creating situations where the Americans are getting involved willy nilly ? Why is it that we want a certificate from the Americans to the effect that we are the better boys that we are better behaved than Pakistan ? And from whom do we want this

{The Vice-Chairman (Dr. Nagen Saikia) In the Chair]

certificate ? Not only from President Bush but also from Senator Pressler. Mr. Vice Chairman I am very upset *n*\ a citizen of this country as a Member of Parliament at these going on. A US Senator whose only claim to fame is that he bad moved an amendment in the US Senate visits this country; and when he comes to this country we roll out the red carpet for him, we treat him as if God himself has appeared on our soil; he meets everybody in this country that he wants to meet; when he addresses a press conference he is given the top billing number one news in the officially controlled media and we rejoice at the fact that he has given us a certificate that we do not have the nuclear weapon and that Pakistan has the nuclear weapon. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the simple poser that I am putting before the Foreign Minister, before this Government is. what is our policy in regard to non prolife - ration...

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI : Yashwantii would you please reply to one intervention ? Do you mean to say you are really intelligent ? You know the administration side of the Government. I ask you one question. Suppose there are some more openings going to be made for our economy or other liberalisations for our defence.

What happened to Russia and China where closed-circuit societies are there and where the Government are closed? Would you like India to be a closed circuit society?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir I have a great deal of respect for Kulkarniji. If he just has the patience to listen to me as I develop my theme the question that is bothering him will become more than clear.

The point that I am making is this: What is our stand today on nuclear non proliferation? What is out stand? This is a very important issue before this country and Mr. Rrampd Mahajan referred to it ear Her. We know that Pakistan has the bomb and the Americans—we trust the Americans—have themselves said that Pakistan has the bomb. we have been traditionally a threshold power. It has been our consistent stand that we shall not allow this position to be altered and we have not signed the Nuclear Non Proe

liberation Treaty not only because it is discriminatory but also because we wanted to maintain out threshold status. We want to maintain our status as a threshold power.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: The Prime Minister has said it in the USA.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir Dr. Raja Ramanna an esteemed Member of this House made a Special Mention yesterday and said that the Prime Minister had said in an in terview to the Qqserver" that India was not making the bomb. The Prime Mini ster has been a party to the Resolution in the Security Coun cil in January, the Summit of the Security Council which he attended which gives the impression as if mo rally we had accepted ----------*(Interruptions)* -------

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: No .*(Interruptions)*_____I was there.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: That is a different thing. When Mr. Pressler comes here and gives a certificate that we do not have the nuclear bomb and that Pakistan has the nuclear bomb, we rejoice in that fact and the kind of treatment that we give to him is a clear indication that if we want to continue in this. Now, I want to ask this Government about one thing.

Sir, Members from this side of the House, the Foreign Minister, Members from the other side of the House have been on a number of occasions, to the US. Have we learnt to use protocol as an instrument of diplomacy ? It is a straight question that I am asking. If Mr. Jagesb Desai is listening to me, let him take note of it. If X understand foreign relations the ABO of foreign relations it is that two countries and certainly the two countreis in which India is involved shall conduct foreign relations on the basis of sovereign equality, that, because we are a proud country, we shall conduc our foreign relations on the basis of sovereign equality. We are not a vassal State, we are not a banana Republic but we are a country, a proud country of 850 million people and we shall conduct our relationship on the basis of sovereign equality. This nation is not a *"chamcha'* nation of an other nation nor is it a client State. If Mr. Jagesh Desai and Mr. Kulkarni and others are listening to me let them tell me, let them stand up here and tell me what the treatment is which is meted to the Indian VIPs who land at the John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. What is the treatment you get and what is the treatment which we give to the visiting American *chhota* VIPs ? What is the treatment ? I am asking this question pointedly: Is this the way to conduct foreign relations on the basis of sovereign equality ? If we are a sovereign and equal country, we should be able to give them equal treatment and if they do not receive us properly, we do not have to, we are under no obligation, to receive them properlv. And, all the time, day in and day out, we are giving the impression as if we are a vassal State, that we cannot stand up to them, that we do not believe in sovereign equality. .. *(Interruptions),..*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB) ; Mr. Sinha, Indian hospitality is known throughout the world ?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA ; Indian hospitality is, of course, famous. But, if the baggage of the Foreign Minister of this country is searched at the New York Airport, then we have no business to extend a red-carpet treatment to any visiting

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

American dignitary either. This is the point I am making. And the Foreign Minister is sitting here. He has experience of what happens when he visits the U.S.

4.00 P.M.

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI : My baggage was never chek-ed.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA ; Your baggage might not have been checked. But there are a number of instances I can give you where Ministers' baggages have been checked, including the Minister of External Affairs.

Now, on the question of foreign policy, as I was saying, if we want to conduct our relations on the basis of sovereignty and equality, if we want to improve our relations with Pakistan, on the basis of the Simla Agreement, we should discuss directly with Pakistan instead of trying to go through U.S. and trying to put pressure through U.S., and thereby queering the pitch. It is very unfortunate that the Prime Minister of this country has a discussion with the Pakistani Prime Minister in Switzerland and Davos and next day Pakistan observes a 'Bandh' and they are marching on our borders. What came out of the discussion ? Why was not the issue resolved in that discussion ? And why was it necessary for the Prime Minister not to make it clear what exactly transpired and why was the Pakistani Prime Minister not prepared to listen to this ?

Again, take the question of Israel. I remember there was a question in this House and we all got up and said—most of us—in any case, and we said that the Govenrment should not be a prisoner of the past and should look at our relationship with Israel in a dynamic, developing situation ? What was the reply that we got repeatedly from the Ministry of External Affairs, Minister of.. External Affairs ? We were told only in the last session that India shall consider upgrading its ties, diplomatic ties, with Israel only after the successful negotiations of the West Asia peace talks. Repeatedly we said, "don't wait, do it now", but we were told, "we will not but we shall wait for the West Pakistan peace talks to come to a satisfactory conclusion". And then, what happened ? What has happened to West Asia peace talks ? Nothing. No progress has been made. And what compelled us not to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel ? What has happened in the meanwhile ?What earth-shaking change has taken place in international environment or in our relations that this has been done ? Somebody from the Government side should explain this point. I charge, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the position has been changed only because of the pressure of the United States of America. If that pressure had not been exerted, if it had not been made clear this is how India should tackle that question, then we would have still been waiting and we would not have recognized Israel. The point I am making is, why can't we take our own decisions ? We are not today in a position to take our own decisions in the field of external affairs, in the field of foreign policy, because we have surrendered elsewhere, Mr. Vice-Chairman. And this is one whole unit. You cannot bifurcate it into economic, into political, into foreign policy issues. International relations are changed on the basis of one unit, one whole. If you give in here, you give in there. If today our decisions are untenable in Uruguay in regard to Dunkel proposals, if today our position is compromised on the question of sovereignty, it is a part of a bigger whole, which is getting reflected in foreign policy also.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will come to the question of economy, the IMF, the World Bank. But before I say what I have to say, I would

like to make one point clear. The other day when Mr. Hanumanthappa was seconding this motion, he got up to say that when I was the Finance Minister we had approached the International Monetary Fund and that we had left the country in such mess, etc. etc. And repeatedly it has been said here in this House as well as elsewhere that if my letter to the International Monetary Fund is placed before Parliament and the people, then I and my Government stand exposed and our claim that India has surendered its decision making authority to the IMF and the World Bank will sound hollow.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to tell the Government that instead of issuing these threats day in and day out, please place the Letter of Intent sent by me to the IMF on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament. Let them place that letter. I have not written to the World Bank as Finance Minister because I did not go to the World Bank for a loan. I do remember that I approached the IMF for a loan which was granted to us in January, 1991, and I did send a Letter of Intent to the Managing Director of the IMF. There is nothing, to my memory, in that Letter of Intent which commits this country to anything which is dishonourable, anything of which we can be ashmed of. And, therefore, in order to put the record straight..*{Interruptions)* I am not in a position to place my Letter of Intent. I shall appeal to the Government..

AN HON. MEMBER : You do it now.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : How can I now ? I don't remember this. And if I do that, I will be violating the oath of secracy which I had taken as a Minister. *{Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANSAMY: Now he says, he is telling from memory.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Yes, I am saying from the memory. I am-------

AN HON. MEMBER : Why don't you place it now ?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: .. saying, stop issuing these threats. Nobody is taken in by these threats. Stop issuing these threats and let the Government come clean. Let them place my Letter of Intent on the Table of the House. And I further charge that the only reason why they are only indulging in threats and not placing my Letter of Intent before the Parliament is that if a comparison is made between the present Government's Letter of Intent to the IMF and separately to the World Bank and my Letter of Intent to the IMF, if that comparison is made, then this Government will stand even more exposed than they have ever been in the past.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : Regarding disinvestment in the public sector, who has started it and how was it started ?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Disinvestment in the public sector which you have carried forward to 49 per cent was started by me. It was a decision which I had taken, and I had justified it then, and I am prepared to justify it now. But I will also tell Mr. Jagesh Desai, if his memory serves him right as my memory does, that when the Winter Session of Parliament had started in 1990. on the 27th of December, I had come out with a statement on the economic situation in the country. In both Houses of Parliament I had made the statement. And in this House, particularly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I remebmber, we has

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

a discussion over that statement over a period of time. We discussed it for 4 to 5 days and everyone participated in it... .,,

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY; Without your reply.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : with a total convincing reply which I gave which silenced every critic. And I had stated clearly what the economic situation was. I had taken the Parliament into confidence. I had concealed nothing from the Parliament. There was no situation that 1 as Finance Minister was com pelled to place *on* the Table of this House or the other House any docu ments under pressure from Mem bers. This is the difference between your approach and my approach. I come to Parliament first, went to IMF later. You went to IMF and World Bank first, and only placed your Letters of Intent and other documents under pressure. This is the difference.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA : They placed it after Mr. Jaipal Reddy placed it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the other point, again reminding you of a story which *I* started, is that it is being trotted out repeatedly by every speaker from that side that the health of the economy deteriorated and was brought to this impasse by the mismanagement of 18 months of the NF Government and our Government. This is the point which is being made repeatedly. Now it is very strange because I do not have to give any arguments to prove what I am saying but I merely have to take this copy of the Economic Survey which was presented by Dr. Manmohan Singh to Parliament in July last year for the year 1990-9). And if the esteemed Members of the Congress Party have not gone through this Economic Survey, then I will very humbly suggest, please go through your Economic Survey and find out what is written here. And if you still say the Sun will rise from the west tomorrow morning, You are most welcome to your opinion because what con 1 do. But this is the other point Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that the economic situation was messed up during the later half of 80s. This is the Economic Survey which is more honest, then the one which has been presented to Parliament this year because perhaps, this is what had continued and they did not have the time to change or fudge the figures very much. This Economic Survey clearly brings out point that it was in eighties that this country's economy was taken for a ride and it is because of that, and if there is any further doubt as to which party, which government was responsible for. the economic mess in which this country finds itself, then 1. am giving another suggestion. Let there be a committee of this Parliament; let there be a committee of this Parliament; let there be a commit tee which will go into it. Let them examine everthing ; let the Estimates committee examine it; let some other committee examine it; let them examine the facts and then tell Parliament and tell the people who was responsible for creating this mass. There is no point in just getting up and saying : 'you people did this; you people did that; what was the foreign exchange on 1st December 1989 and what was the foreign exchange on 19th or 20th June 1991'. We all know what had happened in the meanwhile. Will the Government have the courage, will they have the boldness to appoint this committee to examine all this and then tell the people who was responsible for what ? *i* am prepared to be damned ; I am prepared to stand in the box as an accused, if I am responsible or if my government is responsible. I am sure my friends in the National Front will be equally forthcoming to say that

if they are responsible, then they will stand as an accused. But there is no point in rust going on saying total untruths without any reference to anything.

What does this Economic Survey say ? I have even marked the page here. It says that for the first ten weeks of the financial year 1991-92, the rate of increase in inflation was declining and that decline started even earlier. It talks of the first ten weeks of the financial year 1991-92. And what does it say ? It says that the rate of increse at 1-8 per cent was the lowest recorded since 1984-85, for those ten weeks This is what happened. This was the state in which we left the economy. When we had left, then the rate of inflation was going down sharply and if the rate of inflation has increased, which you don't know how to control, it is only after all those unthought of and unwise steps which your Government has taken. It was not because of any doing on our part. And if you want to know more, let me tell this because at lesat some Members like Mr. Jagesh Desai will understand. The rate of money supply which is generally known as M-3 was 19.4 per cent. This was the growth recorded in 1989-90. The Finance Minister talks of liquidity overhang in the economy which is rsponsible for the price rise. It was 19.4 per cent in 1989-90. And what was it in 1990-91, part of which was managed by Prof. Madhu Dandavate and part of which was managed by me? It came down to 14.9 per cent. That was the rate of money supply in the economy and we were able to bring it down to that level. Again I am taking these figures from your Economic Survey this year. From March 31st to January 11, 1992, if you compare these figures, you will find that the rate of M-3 growth was only 11-3 per cent in 1990-91 against 14-9 per cent in 1991-92. And if money supply continues unabated, then an economist like Mr. Jagesh Desai will understand that you cannot control inflation because you have no control over the demand side, and it is unfortunate that desptei-tight mone policy, despite curbs which has caused recession in the economy. You have not been able to control increase in money supply. It has again *gone* up by a higher percentage than what we had brought it cut. But on the question of the economy, what is bothering us ?

What is it ? 1 am not going into the question of IMF and World Bank. I am not going into the question whether the Budget was leaked or not. I am not going into the question of the IMF conditionalities. I am not going into the question of surrendering our national sovereignty. The previous speakers have mentioned this. I am not interested in going into the details of it.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Mr. Sinha, just one minute. At one time, I asked Prof. Madhu Dandavate in regard to money supply. He said it was 19 per cent. He also said that it was going up. This was at a particular point of time. I remember I had asked him. He said that it was again going up.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : I have referred to the figures given in this year's...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : I am talking about the intervening period.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : 1 am not talking of any conversation that you might have had with Prof. Dandavate. 1 am saying that, on the basis of the Economic Survey presented to Parliament this year, these are the figures. These are the figure?, between March, 1991, to January, 11. These figures have been deliberately mentioned to cover this period. That is the situa-tion-11'3 per cent and 14.9 per cent.

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

Even if we are not going into the question of World Bank and IMF, even if we are not going into the question whether we have surrendered our sovereignty or not, what is it that concerns us ? What concerns us are two things.

One is, we seem to be adopting one policy after another, with tremendous rapidity, with tremendous speed. There is no discussion. Here is no discussion even in the Government. If there is an doubt, let me tell them that in the latter which was sent by the Finance Minister to the World Bank on 11 November, he had gone ahead and given a commitment that steel would be decontrolled and that price restrictions would be removed. But the Cabinet discusses this on 16th January. Is it the way a national Government of a country like India should be run ? On what basis, did the Finance Minister make that commitment that steel decontrol and price decontrol would take place ? On what basis, did he make that commitment on 11th November ? This matter comes before the Cabinet on 16th January. This is what bothers us.- If this is not a surrender, what else is ? Who is responsible ultimately, to protect the sovereignt;, dignity and. honour of this country ? The Go vernment of the day. Parliament and other institutions. Parliament is kept in the dark. Even the Cabinet is kept in the dark. And policy commitments are made.

Similarly as my friend, Mr. Pramod Mahajan was saying,—we are talking of consensus. The Prime Minister had said. I have got a copy of his lecture on economics which he had given at Davos.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN : (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Mr. Yashwant Sinha, your party has twenty-eight minutes. There is one more speaker from your party.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Sir, I am conscious of the time. The Prime Minister went to Davos. I tried to get a copy, an authentic copy, of his speech, but I was not able to get it. However, I have this newspaper report which I obtained % from the Library. This is what he had said : that India's economic liberalisation policies were irreversible, that foreign investment would be fully protected and that cent per cent foreign equity participation would be allowed in'key industries. *I* would like to pose just this question. Is it proper on the part of the Prime Minister of a country to go abroad and, before an audience consisting almost en irely of foreigners, say that these policies are irreversible ?

Sir, the Prime Minister is in the habit of making three claims in regard to the economic policies. One is that, we had no option. No option situation. The second is, these policies are based on consensus. He says that there is a national consensus to support his policies. The third is, these policies are irreversible. The Prime Minister's contention is to be challenged on each of the three counts. When he goes abroad ana says that these policies are irreversible, one wonders whether we are going to continue as a democracy, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Can any leader in a democratic country—-I pose this question to the House-stand up and say that any policy is irreversible We are committed to the Constitution. We take that oath when we come to the House. But we do not take any oath in regard to a policy. We now know that not only is there no consensus in regard to these economic policies but there is severe opposition in various quarters in regard to these economic policies and that the moment many of us get an opportunity these policies will be reversed. Unless Mr. Narasimha Rao is Prime Minister and this Government is planning by hook or crook to stay in power for all times to coma if that be their design, then, o

course, these policies are irreversible. But, if this country continues to be the kind of democracy that we have known it to be, then, there is no question of irreversibility. This contention, this thesis, therefore, that this economic-liberalisation policies are irreversible has to be contested, has to be challenged and the record has *to* be set right. 1 don't have to stand here, Mr. Chairman, to defend the policies which this Government has and this party has followed.

SHRI V. NARAYANSAMY : We also expect this from you.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : I don't have to do it. But since you have run away from them. I have to remind you that they were your own leaders, your own Prime Ministers repeatedly who have formulated these policies. It was Pt. Nehru, it was Indiraji who brought this Foreign Exchange Act and who said that in this country no more than 40 per cent shall be the equity holding of a foreign company, Mr. Narayanasamy.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You have to see the changing global scenario.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : The changing global senario...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You want to be in a small well. What can I do ? The global scenario you have to see, how developing countries are. Otherwise nobody can help you. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Please let him continue.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is for their party, it is for the Members of Parliament, it is for others to decide what they are reversing. But I am not concerned with small little party matters.

But, what I am saying is that the economic policies of the country have been constructed not by the Congress Party alone. It is the product of our freedom movement. It is the product of all those leaders who participated in the freedom movement. These policies have been crafted, designed over a long number of years, over decades, and the rapidity with which you are abandoning them, is what socks, surprises and pains a person like me. This is the problem. This is what causes anguish. This is what causes pain. You are abandoning your party policies. Fine, you can adopt new policiee. But you are abandoning the nationally accepted policies. That is the cause of concern for a person like me. And these policies that you are adopting are not based on national consesus. They are not even based on, as friend, Mr. Pro-mod Mahajan was saying, a concensus within your own party. Some day it is all going to blow up, and. you are all going to collapse like a house of cards, let me tell you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Don't dream like that.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : सिन्हा जी, जैसे 11 महीने में हो गया है वैसा होने वाला नहीं है, यह बात ध्यान में रखिए ।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Don't dream like that.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I draw attention to two or three more points, and then I will be done.

The President in his address has talked about agriculture. Shri Ram Naresh Yadav who moved this Motion of Thanks, has been very close to agricultural ' interests, He

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

has done a lot in his own political career to further and protect agriculturists' interests. What has the President said ? The President's Address says that a number of step will be taken for pest control, prevention of soil erosion, better in situ moisture , conservation, horticulture, animal husbandry, livestock development, and agro-processing will be given high priority etc. and also sheep, poultry, what not. The President delivers his Address to both the Houses of Parliament on the 24th February, and the Finance Minister presents his Budget on the 29th February, five days later.

I have here the expenditure statement for 1992-93. Mr. Vice-Chairman, soil conservation goes down from Rs. 100 crores to Rs. 90 crores. Animal husbandry goes down from Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 57 crorts.

Dairy Development goes up marginally from Rs. 98 crores to Rs. 100 crores ; plantations go down from Rs. 51 crores to Rs. 8 crores. *{Interruptions).*

THE VTCE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. NAGEN SAIK1A) : Hon. Member, if you have anything to talk to the Minister, kindly go to the lobby. Mr. Madani, I request you kindly to go to the lobby and talk.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : In all the sectors, which the President, in his speech, said will receive a special encouragement, the Finance Minister has reduced the outlays in the Central Plan. That is the point that 1 was making. The President also has talked about the Wasteland Development Programme and Environment etc. etc. The environment budget has also been reduced. Environment and Forests share has come down from Rs. 300 crores in this year's Budget to Rs. 280 crores in the next years's Budget. This is the way in which the Finance Minister has accommodated the priorities which have been set out in the President's Address. I am talking of facts. These are the papers which are before me. Is there anyone who wants to challenge ? Now, how do-- we treat this document ? Whom should we thank ? For what ? Shall we say that we are thanking the President because he is not able to carry the Finance Minister with him, that we are thanking the Government for having suggested this Address to the President because they have not been able to carry the Finance Minister with them and that the Finance Minister has ur-done almost everything that the President had said will be done in agriculture, rural sectors forests, environment and ail that ? Is this manner in which the. President's Address to both the Houses of Parliament should have been allowed to be treated in the Budget ? What are we doing here ? Why are we here ? I intend to ask these very basic questions. Will some body stand up there and say that all this is wrong ? We are doing a great disservice to the President in whose mouth we want to put these words, to utter these words and speak this language. This is what has happened.

He has talked about cleaning major tributaries. I had asked a question in this session. There was a deadline that the cleaning of the rivers will be done before 31st December, 1991. This has been extended unilaterally by the Environment and Forests Ministry by one year. There is a case pending in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court had demanded that all those who are polluting these rivers, especially the Ganga, should appear before the Supreme Court and satisfy themselves that they have done it. In that reply the Government confirms the fact that they have extended the deadline by another year.

Why ? Why is the President being made to say all this then ?

Much has been made of the fact that foreign exchange reserves have now crossed Rs. 10,000 crores as if crossing Rs. 10,000 crores was breaking the four-minute barrier in running a mile. I do not know why Rs. 10,000 crores is so sacrosanct. Recently I read somewhere that the reserves have gone up to Rs. 11,400 crores. Very good. Let the Government pat itself on its back. But how has the reserve been built up ? One of the friends on this side was saying it is built up of the loans. No. It is also built up of import compression you look at the figures, which the Commerce Minister was correcting the other day in this House in response to the question which I had asked. Do you know what has been the extent of compression ? The extent of the import compression between April-December of this .financial year has been to the extent of almost Rs. 9,000 crores. If this compression on the import side had not taken place, then the Government would not have been in .a position to claim all the tall claims which are being made of Rs. 11,000 crores or Rs. 10,000 crores and all that. Rs. 9,000 crores, almost $4 billion, you have been able to save as a result of the import compression. That is how your reserves have been built up. Please don't be complacent. With all the liberty, with all the licence that you have given to the industry to start importing with both bands, all these reserves will vanish in no time. Let me tell you this. What is most bothersome is we talk—the Prime Minister also talks—of strengths of this economy. It is precisely those strengths that we are trying to destroy.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Will you yield for a minute ?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Okay.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA ; You said that foteign exchange reserves will vanish in no time. I appreciate that our imports are rising. But the Finance Minister has clari~ tied that there is an automatic balance. because of the partial convertibility of the rupee. Can you enlighten me because you are an ex-Finance Minister and that is why I am asking this clarification from you ?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Sir, I don't need to enlighten Santosh]*!. He is a very enlightened person himself. But if I could make just one submission, in fact. India, has always had a massive trade deficit. Year after year we have been running a trade deficit. So whether you divide it into forty, sixty or you divide it into thirty, seventy or fifty, fifty whichever way you divide it, both portions will be inadequate to meet your requirements. If there is a trade deficit, then, neither will sixty suffice for OGL nor will forty suffice for essential imports. Therefore, you will have to dip into your reserves. Do you think all the petroleum that you want to buy, all the fertilizers that we want to buy, all the essential imports that we want to make will be covered by that 40 per cent of our export earnings? If export earnings were enough to finance our imports, then, we will not be in this position. They are not adequate with all the liberalisation that you have introduced. Export earnings have not shown any upward tendency and there is abso-'. utely no scope for it. Let me tell you that there is an international recession. The U.S. economy is in a very deep recession and unless the Americans and the West Europeans get out of this recession, you are not going to see any dramatic rise in exports. Therefore, we will continue to suffer from trade deficit and trade deficit will mean whether you convert the rupee 100 per cent on the tade account or 40 percent, 30 per cent, it will be inadequate. We will have to dip into our reserves and that is how these reserves will

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

be depleted. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are talking again of new Housing Policy in the President's Address. We are talking again of a new Education Policy in the President's Address. I have not been very long in this House only for four years. But I remember that we have debated in this House a new Education Policy. We have adopted a new Housing Policy. How many times shall we go on changing our National Policies ? How many times ? We will not build houses, but we will build new Housing policies every year. That is what we go on doing. We will not improve education but we will go on talking of a new Education Policy every now and then- What is this ? This is the kind of thing which has been said.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, one last point and that is in regard to the Uruguay Round. The President in his Address has said that the Urguay Round of negotiations have reached a crucial stage. In fact, they have reached a terminal stage, if 1 could put it that way because it is terminal for India. From our point of view nothing could have been more disastrous than the manner in which the Uruguay Round of negotiations have been conducted. I am saying it with all the responsibility at my command that from day one in 1985, when the first round was held in Punta del Este in Uruguay, in every round, in every discussion, we have gone on surrendering our position one after the other. We have surrendered one after the other. We are caught up in this jam. Why are we in this jam ? We are in this jam because of the concessions that we have granted across the negotiating table, from time to time. We could not take decisions which were in our own national interest. I will tell you one more thing that when we were in power for a brief period, the final round was going to be held in Brussels, we were very clear in regard to textiles and in regard to. the Intellectual Property Rights that India shall not surrender its nationally accepted policies. Who was responsible for this Patent Act of 1970 ? Do you know that ? It was Mrs. Gandhi. Do you know what was said at that time ? It was said that India mall be isolated, that nobody will trade with India, that we shall become pariahs of the international community. Nobody will talk to us. Despite all these protestations despite all these oppositions, she was firm in her resolve—let me say this to her credit— to get the Patent Act passed in 1970. The Patent Act of India has been hailed throughout the developing world as a model Act. Every sensible thing in that Patent Act today is being challenged by this Dunkel draft. Everything will have to be given up by us. Precess patent will have to be replaced by poduct patent or both. The period of patent, Mr. Vice-Chairman, will have to go up from 5 to 14 years, as in our case, to 20 years- The burden of proof will shift from the prosecutor to the accused. It is the accused who will have to prove that he is not guilty This will cover not only inventions but also discoveries.

Genes which are already being patented will be subject to patent and the whole new field of biotechnolgy, about which our friend Prof. M. G.K.. Menon talks here repeatedly the new frontier science, will become a prisoner in the hands of the developed countries. Our farmers will have to depend, for their seeds year after year, on foreign suppliers. This country will be signing on the deed of slavery or bondage, if we sign on the dotted line in the Dunkel Draft. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am appealing to this Government, 'Don't take it lightly." We have agreed, in the beginning in the Uruguay Round, that all these will be separate tracks; the TRIP will be separate ; the TRIM will be separate; services will be separate; and merchandise will be separate;

there will be four separate agreements. Now, do you know what has happened ? The Dunkel Draft interconnects, interlinks, all of them and *it* says that any violation of one will open you to retaliation on the others. If you do not behave on Intellectual Property, then they will penalise you by retaliating in the field of textiles. And not only this. They are going a step further. They are saying that even the international financial instructions like the world bank and the IMF will be linked to this and if you do not behave properly in the GATT then you will not be able to get loans from the IMF and the World Bank. And why has *it* come to this ? The IMF, the World Bank and the GATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, are not representative institutions. They are not democratic institutions. We all know that the World Bank President is always an appointee of the U.S. President. We all know that the Managing Director of the MF can only be a European or a West European. No Indian can become the world Bank President. No Indian can become the Managing Director of the IMF. And in the GATT, the developing countries are at a disadvantage. We all know this. All of us who have any knowledge of international trade know this, "the UNCTAD has just finished in a certain Latin American country. Our Commerce Minister was there. An hon. Member of this House had also gone as part of the delegation. Does anybody in this House recall the knid of status which *the* UNCTAD enjoyed when the UNCTAD session was held in Delhi in 1968 ? That was the forum of the developing countries. That was the forum of theG-77. That was the forum where we used our strength of unity to get concessions out of the developed countries. Why did we ever agree to discuss all these in the GATT forum ? That itself is a sign of weakness. We knew that we were in a bad bargaining position there.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the point I am making-is that there is a cons piracy. When the Home Minister got up here in this House and said that there was a conspiracy in the assassination of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, I, for one, d*id* not take him lightly. His colleagues, his party people, might have taken him lightly. But I did not take him lightly. I am conscious of the fact that, after the collapse of the erstwhile Soviet Union, there is an international conspiracy to dismember our beloved country; that some people in this world want India to be weak. They want India to be subservient. They want India to become a client State. They want India to become a banana republic. And it is to this danger that I would like to most humbly draw the attention of the Treasury Benches. If we are not conscious of this danger, if we are not alive to this danger, then we are being less than nationalistic. We have to stand up. When I talk of conducting relations with other countries on the basis of sovereign equality, this is what I mean. When I say we should protect our interests in the GATT Round this is what I mean when I say that we should do something to strengthen this country, this is what I mean. We shall have to stand on our own two feet. Nobody else is going to help us do that. It will have to be done by our own efforts. And it is with this route that we can make this country great, we can make this country powerful and then hold our head high in the Comity of Nations and by four billion dollers or two billion dollars" of foreign investment not by the kind of foreign technology, prawns, Barbie dolls, Mandrake comics and things of that kind that you are bringing in this country. For God's sake, don't do *it.* For God's sake, don't walk, into that trap. My voice might be falling on deaf ears, Mr. Vice Chairman. But let

me appeal with all the humility at my command, with all the emphasis at my command that this country is today facing a grave threat. It is facing a grave challenge in a unipolar world and if we do not stand up, if we do not unite to meet the challenge and protect our national interest, it will be too late. Then it will not matter who belongs to the Congress party, who belongs to the Janata Dal and who belongs to the BJP. We will all be in the same mess. Let us make up and let us not do things which our forebears forbade us from doing. They were leaders of this country who became leaders of yours party after independence. Let us recall what warning they have given. Let us recall what they said was good for this country and things won't change so quickly. If in 1974, it was Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who was forcing the foreigners to dilute their equity and bring is down to forty per cent, in fifteen or sixteen years nothing has changed in this world so dramatically that we should offer 100 per cent to them on a platter as the Prime Minisiter seems to have done in Davos.

There are a lot of things in this document. I thought I will draw attention to the more important ones. Let us remember that this document has a certain value. The President should not be made a mockery of. His address should not be given the kind of short shrift which this Government after five days has given to it. Let us set healthy traditions. Let us improve the norms of political conduct and that is where I will remnd you of the story with which I starred. I might say, :he sun rises from the east. You might say, no, the sun is rising from the west and there will be no means to trying 10 convince you. Therefore, despite the fact that I have depended on facts and figures, I do not know how much conviction I have carried. If five per cent of what I have said goes home, then I think, my job would have been welt done.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Shri G. O Swell. Mr. Swell, only two mintus ot your party's time has been 1 left.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Meghalaya) : Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I am happy to have been here and hearing my friend, Mr. Yashwant Sinha, because he has thrown a little bit of light on what is the subjec before the world—the Dunkel proposals of GATT—but I am afraid, I have not seen reasons to agree with his conclusions because bravura does not help us to solve the problem-We are in a difficult position. I agree that to retain our sovereignty, we should stand on our feet. But how are we going to do that ? That is the question before us. However my concentration *in* the speech will be mostly confined to the area of foreign affairs. I was happy to have seen the Foreign Minister here. I thought he would have been here and hear me out. But 1 am happy, my colleague, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, who had also been the Foreign Minister at onetime, is here. Sir, today, as, never before in. the history of our country, we stand at a global junction and we have to choose a path and choose it carefully. In that context, I think, this speech of the President, which he took one hour to read, is an amazing document.

It is amazing because of its lack of vision, lack of direction, lack of comprehension. I am using each one of these words advisedly and with clarity in my mind. It is amazing as an exercise in evasion, in evasion of the real problems that concern us. Sir, I would agree that an annual Address by the President would be a kind of review of what the Government has been doing and what it proposes to do. But today we are in a point of history when the world has undergone a cataclysmic change. One entire trading and power bloc has disappeared. A super-power has disintegrated. That

super-power today is knocking at the door of another super-power for rescue and assistance. You have seen in the newspapers of yesterday that the Russian Federation has agreed to all the conditionalities of of the International Monetary Fund in order to get a loan of 11 billion dollars to bail it out. But that is not the end of the story. They are still embroiled in their internal turbul-lence. One does not know whether President Yeltsin would remain in that position for long. Alreaay part of the erstwhile Soviet Union is in the grip of a civil war between one group and the other. This is the world in which we live. I would agree with Mr. Yashwant Sinha that the situation has given an accre-tion of strength to certain countries which have always been dominant in the fields of commerce and economy. It has given an accretion of strength to the multinationals that today they have all the technologies and all the patents. I thought that in this Address of the President there should have been a summation of what his Government's world view is. What does the Government of India think of the world today? In the present context where does it want to go? Where is it going to lead this country? There is nothing at all in this Address of the President. The other day I could almost hear a sigh of relief on the part of the Government of India when the 26th February came and went and America did not impose Section 301 of the Trade Law on us, that we had been reprieved. As is Customary with us always for self-praise, always to collect certificates I Even before we recognised Israel, we had to have Yasser Arafat to come here and give us a green signal and a certificate as if we cannot take any decision on our own, as Customary with us we could also have congratulated ourselves and pointed out that a great powerful country like China with a trade surplus of 14 billion dollars with the USA had to yield to American pressure and to agree to the protection of American patents in China. They had to agree and we had been reprieved. It was something for self-congratulation.

The Americans had given us -a reprieve, and that too a short reprieve, because next month this question will come up again in the next Uruguay Round of negotiations in Paris, when this question of the American 301 of their trade law will come back, will metamorphose into some kind of an agreement under GATT and what you call the TRIPS or Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights and there you will have the stamp of authority of an international body. It will no longer be a unilateral or bilateral action of America on us. It is an action of the whole body under the seal of GATT when you have to agree to this. If the Americans had not given us this reprieve, today India would have been in a tail-spin. The entire Budget presented by the Finance Minister would have gone into a tail-spin. Our exports should have plummted because the Americans would have banned exports to America. Americans are anxious to ban exports to their country. Mr Yashwant Sinha just now said, America is going through an acute phase of recession and President Bush today in his election campaign is losing a lot of support because the American economy is in a bad shape. If the Americans had imposed 301 our exports would have plummted or our calculations would have gone wrong and if we had agreed the prices of our pharmaceuticals, chemicals or medicines, the whole range of goods, would have shot through the ceiling making all the calculations wrong. I am surprised that the President did not refer to this; or if he referred at all it is in a very bland manner. All that he had to say on this question are two bland sentences: I quote :

> "The Uruguay Round of negotiations has reached a crucial stage."

Mr. Sinha said, "a terminal stage."

"We snail continue to defend our vital interests and seek im provements _____"

What are our vital interests? What are the things at stake in the next Uruguay Round of negotiations in Paris nexi month? What are the improvements you seek?

THE VICECHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): Within three minutes you have to conclude.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Please, I have just begun.

THE VICECHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): No. *I* curtailed the time because there are three speakers.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Let me speak. Don't disturb my train of thoughts. This is the problem.

THE VICECHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): I am helpless.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Now, what are the interests, you are going to safeguard? This is what 1 want to know. *(Interruptions)*... .1 will just conclude on the subject. Don't disturb my train of thoughts.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): When the time comes I, shall have to ring the bell. I will give you only on.; minute.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Don't disturb my thoughts. I can see a curious thing and at the same time I have a good lot of things to say about America. There is one curious sentence. I quote again:

"The United States is our largest trading partner and a major source of technology, ft has been supportive of our efforts to overcome our temporary economic difficulties and launch a far reaching programme of economic reform. "

I would like to know what the Americans have done on this. I am not anti America. As a matter of fact, I am for greater and close coope ration with America. I wish that our Ministry of External Affairs understands the world situation to day, it understands the global con cern of America better today. I wish they understand the situation about Non Proliferation Treaty. I don't understand the statement made by the .Prime Minister. When you say you are not going to make atom bomb what are you going to do? Pedantry, high moralising pos ture does not have a place in today's world. We say that we are not going to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty until all the nuclear powers have been dismantled. Today I would like to tell this Government that there isa literal landslide for nu clear disarmament. The Soviet Union would like to get rid of all its nuclear weapons as quickly as pos sible and is trying for kelp from the United States and Britain and other countries to dismantle their nuclear weapons. We have on our door step Pakistan which has said almost in so many words that they have got the nuclear bomb. The President of Kazakhstan was here the other day. We have talked to him. But we neatly forget the fact that Kazakhstan is a big nuclear power country. We don't make the bomb. But at the same time we don't sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. What does it mean? If you want nuclear disarmament,
the first thing you have got to do is to see that our neighbour Pakistan is denuded of the nuclear weapons and that you can do, not by bombing Pakistan, not by building a nuclear weapon ourselves but by seeing that the world opinion is framed that Pakistan should expose itself to a full scope examination by a world

body, the International Atomic Energy Agency. There _ is no other way to do that. I think, a proposal has been made, as a beginning, of the five nations getting together, may be the present Russian Federation or whatever it is, the United States of America, China, India and Pakistan. We sit down together and find out how to make this place a nuclear weapon free zone and under that context to see that. Pakistan exposes all its nuclear facilities to full scope inspection. That is the only way. There is no other way. When we ourselves have said that we are not going to manufacture a bomb, either you meet the Pakistani threat or the Kazakhastan's threat or the threat of this Islamic Fundamentalist Arc all over in the north. You are going to see that Kashmir some day, maybe in the next couple of years will no longer be the interna law and order question of India; it will no longer be a dispute between India and Pakistan; but Kashmir will be the beachhead of this Fundamentalist Islamic Arc which is also a nuclear weapon confederation. Either you make the bomb or you dont, and you see that all the cuntries dont have the bomb. The only forum to do that will be in the United Nations; it will be only a joint action on regional basis. That is what I want to say and I would appeal to this Government. Just one word more. That is ail. I wanted to talk more about it. If my friend? here who are talking can give me an answer, 1 shall be happy. I am dumbfounded not to see a single sentence referring to our next door third largest neighbour country, Burma. It has the longest boundary with us. land and see together. Things are happening in Burma. China has given one billion worth of arms to Burma and with these arms given by China the military regime in Burma is fighting.

5.00 PM

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Please conclude in one minute.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : We know what is happening. Refugees from Burma.. .*(Interruptions)*...

SHRT SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, he is speaking on a very important thing. so let him continue...*(Interruptions)* ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : You should not be advocating for him.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I am finishing. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. you are in danger. In the next couple of years you might find yourself under the aegis of Burma supported by China. At one time Assam was invaded by Burma. You know that very well. Refugees from Burma are there in Nagaland. Hundreds and thousands of refugees are there in Bangladesh. They wanted to open a way up to China because of their trade agreement with China. China is not interested in having democracy in Burma. Its interest is to see that its influence, its writ runs all over Burma. What are we doing ? We are behaving like the ostrich, burying our heads in sand and not seeing anything at all. I am surprised. I am dumbfounded. I would like to say they have no comprehension. They do not comprehend what is going around. This kind of short-sightedness is really something which I do not understand. I will expect of this Government to sit down with the Members of Parliament and talk to us. Just because you are a Minister, it does not mean you know everything, I know of Home Ministers who do not even read their daily newspapers. They do not know anything. But they are running this country. Therefore it would be good for them if they learned some humility and talked to us. You can learn from us. Thank you very much. These are the few observations that I wanted to make. I am unhappy with the President's Address.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Shri Hiphei.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, it was my turn. I have to go to Hyderabad by today's flight. Yesterday also my chance had been overstepped. X postponed my journey.... *(Interruptions)*.. .I had requested the Chair to allow me to speak.. (*Interruption)...I* seek your protection. I have a right to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SA1K1A) : Ms. Hiphei, I would request you to allow him to speak since he has to go to Hyderabad.. .*(Interruptions)*...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra) : Sir, how can this be done ? It is our turn... *(Interruptions)*. ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Ms. Khaparde, do not argue. I am just requesting Mr. Hiphei since Mr. Reddy has to go to Hyderabad. This is only a mutual adjustment and I am requesting the Member.

SHRI HIPHEI (Mizoram) : Okay, Sir.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY : I thank the Treasury Benches for giving me this opportunity to speak.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra) : Mr. Reddy, please broaden your heart while speaking.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY : The difficulty is I have to speak as an Indian and I have to depend on what is happening,. That is why I can only say that this document the . President's Address does not keep the Indian situation in its perspective. It has revealed has

16 RS—15.

bankruptcy of this Government It has revealed that it has no solution to any of the problems facing the country. Whether it is Punjab, or Kashmir or Assam, *it* has no solution to the problem. It also does not have any solution to the social problems in the country. They do not have any means be-came the budget does no provide them with one. There is no package deal for Punjab or for the develop ment of Kashmir or for solving the grievances of the people of Assam. The Finance Minister has referred to the East India Company. I want them to go into what had happened in the past. The past is the root of, the present. The East India Company looted our country to such an extent that it was possible for the British Industrial Revolukon to take place. It was for the first time in the whole world that an industrial revolution was successfully carried out in Britain. It gave powers to the Britishers that they were the rulers of the whole world. The sun never set in the British empire. The East India Company stood at the doors of the Indian kings and were begging for audience so that they could do some trading in some places. In Chandragiri of my State, in the Darbar hall, there is a plaque in which it is written : "British representatives were Waiting and waiting for audience and they finally got the audience and they got the right to do trading at Chenna-patna". That Chennapatna,. a fisherman's village,, is now Madras. That is how they came in. The traders became the rulers. We cannot forget that. Their rale was to smash the Indian economy, to smash the Indian industry and to cut the fingers of the handloom workers so that they could not compete with Lancashire. They smashed the agriculture of our country. That was why we suffered from famines. I had an opportunity to visit Bengal during the famine days of 1943. I saw *the* corpses lying in the streets of Calcutta There were corpses everywhere

These were no place to bury those corpses. They were thrown in the rivers. Even at Chittagong, this was the condition. Did the farmers of Bengal fail in those days ? No, Bengal had a bumper crop. But the hoarders hoarded and the Britishers wanted -the grains hoarded for the use of the army. That-was why the Britishers not only, hampered .our progress but they also created vested Interests in our country. Let the Treasury Beach not forget about this. "Who -were those vested interests ? . They were the Princes,-the landlords and those businessmen who were trading with the "Britishers and they were the supporters of the Britishers. They were preaching that the Britishers were the civilisers. Today, we have come a full circle. There are some people who also embrace those ideas. Unless you curb those vested interests, there cannot be any progress in this country. This is why I blame this Government that this has never: tried to deal with those vested interests of the country. It is true that Jawaharlal Nehru dream about India where the mixed economy would rule, there would be an in . centime for everybody, the land will belong to the poor and every part of the country will have an opportunity to develop. But his ideas have been defeated by the vested interests and for that defeat some of his own partymen were responsible, because they were in league with the vested interests. That is why- when these problems were facing the country, those of us who were genuinely fighting for new ideas, came up with proposals for structural - changes that the society required. What are those structural changes ? Those structural change are .embedded in the Directive . Principles in the Constitution. Aud *I* charge this Government with floating thoss irective Principles under the Constitution. It is clearly stated, " _____ that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment." What else is happening today ? You have written off the MRTP Act. The sky is the ceiling for your multinationals, if you cannot govern this country according to the Constitution, you better get out. That is why we said structural changes today mean unearthing of the black money which" is bashing this country,, which is a parallel economy. Over Rs. 50,000 crores of black money is piling up in this countrv. And this Government is sleeping for the past forty year?.

What happened to land reforms? Everytime it is being repeated in the Five Year Plans. But .still-land is getting accumulated in the hands of landlords. Because of unequal trade agriculture has become not profitable and the villages give a desolate appearance. Then, workers, participation in the management is also there in the Directive Principles under the Constitution. But the World Bank and * the IMF don't agree to the workers" participation in the industrial, management. We say for an industry capital and workers are eqally important. But when it comes to management, we listen to the.IMF. Similarly, minimum wages are also not implemented Similar is the case about recognising the rights of the tribal people in the forests or - wherever they reside about land being given to them, forest produce being given to them, about giving a share-in the administration to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the Backward Classes. Nothing is being done to curb the growing atrocities on the SC/STs and BCs and also on women. It is an everyday occurrence. Atrocities are going on. And this Government wants us to believe that it is protecting the interests of the poor and the downtrodden.

[Dr. G.Vijaya Mohan Reddy]

The Centre should set right the strained relations between the Centre and the Spates so that the Slates get their due share from the Common Pool and they can satisfy their own people with development. This also has not been attended to by the Government. The Central Government wants to get all the money and alt the power to itself.

The most importance thing is to curb corruption. Now the Win Chhadhas and the Hindujas are smiling because this Government cannot take any action aginst them because of their conduits to the upper echelons. That is why corruption is winked at and the public sector has become the milch cow for the capitalists, for the politicians of the resting party and also for the bareaucrats. And we keep on blaming the public sector that it is not performing. But nobody is able to prove that the public sector itself should bear the responsibility for the losses being made. Even when sickness is reported by the private sector industries, even when those private sector units fall sick due to mismanagement, and transferred to public sector the entire blame is sought- *to* be put on the public sector.

Another most important thing is the stashing-away of funds in foreign banks. The World Bank was saying that every year foreign exchange worth US$ 3,000 to 4,000 crores is going into foreign banks. Some economists have estimated that this figure could be equal to as much as our foreign debt. How could this money go out except through black deals ? Our exports have. also suffered due to non-repatfiation of the export earnings. There is under-Invoicing, overinvoicing. And the earnings of the joint ventures do not come back to the country. And what about the kickbacks? In all trade transactions huge amounts of Indian money go out to foreign basks. Even if a trickle of that comes to our country, we do not require any loan from the World Bank. , But this Government cannot take action against the Violators of the law of the. land, or against the hoarders. In the capital city of: Delhi itself the Delhi Administration was able to bring out from the hoarders three" lakh quintals of grains and pulses. Yet till now no action has been taken against the offenders. It came out in the press that so many people were interfering so that no action could be taken against these culprits. This is the sad story. Now how can anybody have confidence in your Government ? You want the people to tighten their belts, you want the handloom workers starve; and die, you except the worker to sustain in this highcost environment, you want the students to carry on with studies with the ever increasing tuition fees ! How can-you expect the people *to* tighten their belts while you protect everything that is reactionary, everything that is anti-people, everything that goes against the Indian people ? That is why I say, what all you say is falsehood. That is why I say you want to create an atmosphere where you need to seek help From world; agencies without realising what image of India they are thus creating in: the eyes of the world The world agen-cies today think that India is not in a position to meet evenist interest obligations. That is the crux of the problem. You are not able' to meet your interest obligation*. How do we solve this problem ? By getting more and more loans By accepting their cooditionalities 1 The conditionalities of those people who said India. had no reliability And today after giving more and more loaas to- India they start thinking that India has saidenly become reirable, because India has accepted the conditionalities which-they have imposed on it *I* And what to the conditionalities mean ? The economic: freedom- of this country the political freedom of this corn try have been morgtaged. And our.

policies are being reviewed by foreign agencies, our expenditure is being reviewed by foreign agencies. Mr. Maran has said many things about this particular matter and I need not go into details again. That-is why *i* say this is a very, very sad situation. The nation is getting into an atmosphere of scare, an atmosphere of taxes, taxes which are direct, taxes which are indirect, and taxes which the taxpayer himself does not know.

Sir, india produces the cheapest coat in the world. In spite of lack of modernization, India's , coal costs only one-third of the coal produced anywhere in the world. But eveything-else that, comes from coal is costly. Because they accepted the condtionalities imposed by the World Bank, they sorted to devaluation of the Indian rupee to the extent of 22 per cent and our foreign debt burden has gone up to that extent. You have done it with one stroke of pen Has the Government any authority to do this '? Has it the sanction of the people to sign for the devaluation of the Indian currency ? How can you increase the debts of this country by one-fourth without the knowledge of the people ? But this has been done in this country. That is why our exports are cheaper and imports costlier. When we import, it is costlier for us and cheaper for them. In this way, the entire thing, the entire economic relationship has been made topsy-turvy. What is the impact of these burdens which have been thrown on the backs of the 90 percent of the Indian people ? The poor men, the working men, the middle-class men, the students the intellectuals—all these people are bearing the brunt and they are carrying these burdens on their shoulders and it is the neo-rich who have become richer and it is those People who indulge in all illegal and lack transactions who are happy about this. *

SHRI M. M. JACOB But you will miss your flight!

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY Because of the price rise, all problems are there.... *(Inter ruptions)* _____

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) ; They want-you to be brief so that you don't miss your flight.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY : I do not want to support a package that is made in the "USA, patented under the US laws. We do not have even the right to process it because processing is not allowed there

Then there is the Dunkel proposal, the "take-it-or-leave-it" proposal. One day they say that it is deterimental to India and, on another day, some other Minister says that it will improve our exports Whom to believe ? As Mr. Yash-want Sinha has said, if there is retreat on one front, there will be. retreat all along the line until the people themselves come into the picture and take the situation into their own hands. That is why, Sir, they want to invite the multinationals and their collaborators. But I can only say, "They shall not pass!". This was the slogan loved and adopted by the late Jawaharlal Nehru when he greeted the Spanish Revolution. About Punjab, Sir, it has been said that the Congress Government has conducted elections. But the elections were to be conducted on the 22nd of the June itself. In the morning, people were to go to the polls- There were thousands of candidates. Pepole were ready forming queques. Then, suddenly they were to go home. What a disappointment, Sir ?.Can this Government rectify the situation which they themselves created ? That is why they have got such poor polling in

[Dr. G- Vijaya Mohan Reddy]

Punjab. They must blame themselves. And they can never come to an understanding about the package for Punjab because from the day the Rajiv Longowal Accord had been signed, there are so many controversies that they are not able to come to any kind of a stable thinking on the matter, and in future also they will not be able to come to that.

About Kashmir, Sir, the only new thing that they have added is airlifting of the Ekta Yatris, the newfound friend of this Party, want the secularists of the Congress Party to understand what damage has been done to secularism of this country and to the democratic principles of our nation by the Ekta Yatris being airlifted to Kashmir, Sir, as the one who was fighting against the Nizam, I know, during those days the National Conference was fighting against the feudal Hari Singh. When it was the question of opting just like the Nizam, Hari Singh opted for independent Kashmir, with the support of the Praja Parishad. When the invaders came to the doorsteps of Srinagar, Mr. Hari Singh fled away with all his courtiers, relations and wealth to Jammu. It was the National Conference which stopped the aggressive invaders. And what did they get, Sir. They got their right for Constitution. They elected 51 Members, and all were from the National Conference. They gave for the first time in India a land reform where the land was taken away, without giving any compensation. That is why, Sir, there is the grudge of the Ekta Yatris. These people want to buy land in Kashmir. They were there for 13 minutes when they hoisted the flag. If they purchased the land, the would not have been there even for 5 minutes. About ULFA also, Sir, the same thing is there. The Congress Party will not be able to come to any decision because these are the problems of development, unemployment and frustration of the Youth, and more resources are to be given to the States,

But this Budget has got zero reserves. It is cutting even the Rozgar Yojana and other Yojanas. How can they give? Then they will have to go and stand in a queue before the IMF and the World Bank in the name of these schemes also. That is why Sir, it is a situation which is very sorrowful for the Indians. And there is the talk of privatisation everywhere. There is the talk of privatisation of education, there is the mushrooming of private schools and colleges and tuition colleges. And every where tuition fer is liked by three or four times. The capitation Fee is hiked and it is very difficult for the students to get educational. And if the student revolts, you want to suppress him. If the teacher revolts, you want to suppress him. You want to interefere with the suto-nomy of the universities also. In the medical care also there is privatisation; there are big hospitals, high-tech hospitals. But the peripheral services are not being taken care of. That is why, Sir, the diseases are re-appearing. Dengue, Kala-azar, Malaria, Tuberculosis, leprosy are in epidemc proportions. In Bihar, Kala-azar is taking its death toll in 30 districts-a disease which was practically eradicated. This is the situation we are exposing ourselves to. And who is going to manufacture the drugs for the national campaigns? Our drug industry in the public sector is being referred to the BIFR for its own sickness because it was producing bulk drugs and supplying to private manufacturers who made money by selling formulations. Who is going to give you drugs? Do you mean to say that the private companies are prepared to manufacture drugs on no-profit no-loss basis? That is why I say the national programmes also will suffer. And that is why, these two programmes of health and education have been left to the winds. What else can we expect of development?

As far as trade union rights are concerned, we are now hearing the, the old Draconian laws are going to

be revived so that the onslaught on the people, the DA. freeze, retern-chment and so many other anti-people activities, cannot be resisted by the people.

In the foreign affairs also, it has been said that economy is the key to the foreign policy. The Americans have not given us respite under Super-301 threat. Amreicans are pressurising us- to agree to the Dunkel package on the basis of 'leave it or take it by which our agriculture will suffer, our bio-technology with suffer, our drug industry will suffer and all along the front, our patent laws will have to be modified and there.will be a retreat. As it is, it has been crearly spelt out that there is a recession; recessionary treads are there in the Indian economy. Agriculture is not. growing* industry also has shown minus growth and as it is, there would be lakh small-scale and medium indus-tries: which are sick. The scenario is very very discouraging and as our tearned-friend was saying, America is also having: a recessionary trend, so also many countries of Europe and' Japan, That is why, to create a possibility for- exports, there is a pressure to accept Dunkel proposals. But to whom do -we export and what, because your policies are affecting the roots of our R&D efforts, the roots *of* our self-reliance.

Finally, I would only say one thing more because the Treasury Benches have suddenly become vary aggressive, and to them my reply is through the slogan of shahid Bhagat Singh who pronounced in this slogan throughout his life. He had given this slogan to the Indian freedom fighters as the greatest weapon and with the same slogan on his lips he faced the hangman's noose and left the world-sr that Indian patriots. may follow in his footsteps. That great slogan I repeat here "Inquilab Zinda-bad'. Long Live Revolution. This is the only reply to the treasury benches, which 1 want to give, on this occasion. 1 would also implore all democratically-minded people on this side and. that side, to vote down this Motion because there is nothing to be thanked for in this Address. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : Shri Hiphei.

SHRI HIPHEI : Sir I do not know whether I will be able to complete my speech' today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR NAGEN SAIKIA) : Otherwise you can continue-tomorrow.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : You can speak up to 6 P.M and then continue tomorrow.

THE VICECHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : If yon can conclude today, it is well and good. If you are not able to conclude today, you can continue tomorrow. Now, before you start, I have to make an announcement.

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOB GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA) : I have to inform Membess that the Business